

AN
ANSWER
TO
A late BOOK

Written against the Learned and
Reverend Dr. BENTLEY,
relating to some *Manuscript Notes*
on *CALLIMACHUS*.

Together with
An EXAMINATION of
Mr. Bennet's APPENDIX, to
the said Book.

L O N D O N :

Printed in the Year, 1697.

AN
ANSWER

TO
A BOOK

written by the Learned and
Reverend Dr BENTLEY
relating to some Manuscript
of CALIMACHUS

134-15

Together with

AN EXAMINATION
of Mr. BENTLEY'S APPENDIX to
the said Book.

LONDON:

Printed in the Year 1699.

THE
P R E F A C E
TO THE
R E A D E R.

TIS but a poor Invitation to the Reader, and an uncommon way of prefacing, to tell him, that he is presented with a Book not worth the perusal. But as the matter is past Denial, and as I am certain to hear of it from other hands; 'tis not so much Ingenuity as Policy to confess it. Some little Account however I think my self oblig'd to give of the Motives that put me upon intermeddling in so insignificant a Debate. There is a Passion call'd by the Latins, Indignatio, which of all others my Nature hath left it least in my Power to resist. one Property of which is not to be able to behold with Patience Lions teaz'd by Gnats: If any thing can justifie such a Passion in so little a Creature as my self, the rude Insults offered to an extraordinary Man, one of whose most

A 2 impotent

The Preface

Mr. B's
pref p. 6.

impotent Adversaries I have in the following Papers taken upon me to bring under Examination, and the Applause with which the Party received them; I should think will do it. What drew this Storm of Criticism upon that Reverend Person, the Reader will find not obscurely intimated to him in the Animadversions I have bestow'd upon Mr. Bennet's Appendix. 'Tis no wonder, that a War so unjustly begun should be prosecuted by not much more Honorable methods; and the Littleness of the Instruments made use of in executing their Revenge added to the Contumely. The Assurance with which their young Hero took the Field, that Air of Superiority with which he every where treats his Adversary, the Acclamations with which the Party, nay the Applauses with which he Himself proclaimed himself Conqueror, made the World begin to look upon the Dr's Case as desperate; and 'twas in every Bodies mouth, Mr. Boyle's Book is an unanswerable piece. Nor was it enough, that Mr. Boyle had posted his despised Dr. Bentley at the top of two hundred and ninety Pages; that he had made him the Jest and Sting of I know not how many thousand Periods, the Common Chat of Coffee-houses and Taverns: He threatens him with yet more dismal things to follow:
That

to the Reader.

That there should be a Book written against P. 287.
him in Latin ; that Foreign Universities
should in due time be inform'd, what a
Man the King of England had to his Li-
brary-Keeper ; and particularly Monsieur
Spanheim, and Monsieur Grævius be in-
structed how to chuse out some more deser-
ving Person to place their Civilities up- P. 289.
on. Nay, and, to put him beyond all 290.
Hopes, he plainly tells him, that he was
fallen into the Hands of an whole Body of
Men, whose Hatreds and Revenges were
Immortal ; who when once they begin
with a Man, there's no knowing when
they will leave him ; and who were re-
solved to use him as unmercifully with their
Pens, as ever Phalaris did poor Innocents
with his Musical Bull.

Had not the Dr. been either very Conscious
to himself of the Goodness of his Cause, or
very insensible of Danger, he would tame-
ly have quitted the Field, and have stri-
ven by Patience and Silence to have mi-
igated their Displeasure. But to the sur-
prize of the Town it was soon got abroad,
that the Dr. did not yield ; nay, that he
did but Laugh at them, and would cer-
tainly give them an Answer. This, we may
suppose, created them some Disturbance.
For I cannot imagine, that they did ever
in their Hearts believe Dr. Bentley to be

The Preface

so very manageable an Adversary as in their Writings they had every where represented him. However, one considerable Advantage they had gained in their first Adventure. The Town and common Fame were on their side, which when once they have fallen in with a false Cry will not easily change their Note. Supported with this Comfort, they were resolv'd to stand their ground, and if the Dr. was for answering them, they would be sure to find him work enough. I very well remember, that some Months before the Dr's last Book was published, I heard it in these very Words and Syllables from a certain Person, whom I suppose no stranger to the Secrets of the Party; "Let the Dr. come out with his
" Answer as soon as he will, they are in
" a readiness for him; to my certain know-
" ledge, saith he, they have Rods in Piss
" against him. Accordingly, within not many Weeks after the Dr's Answer was published (but just time enough for the Club to patch up Mr. Bennet's Appendix) it was followed by this Rod in Piss of a Vindicator: as indeed well it might, all the Sheets (or I am mis-informed) being wrought off before. And here was another piece of work for the Dr. wherein they had him upon an unlucky Dilemma. If he answered it, the Littleness of the Subject, as well as, the
inequa-

to the Reader.

inequality of the Antagonist, must needs have exposed him to Contempt: If he answered it not; that had been interpreted a submitting to the Charge, and would have kept some Life in the Cause. And again; if he answered This, they might have had another piece against him, and after That another; and after That another, and so on; verifying Mr. Boyle's Prediction, that there were an whole Body engaged against him, who when once they begin with a Man, there's no knowing when they will leave him. Nay, I have heard it more than once, that they gave out, they would write a Book against him once a Month as long as he liv'd. Nay, and I can produce my Witnesses, to whom Mr. Bennet, hearing, it seems, that there was something of an Answer designed to the Vindicator, said with his own mouth; That they were best let his Appendix alone: If they Printed any Reflections upon him, he'd be even with them, and have them exposed all the Town over, both in Verse and Prose. And these are the Methods by which the Gentlemen of the Half-Moon are resolved to humble the Library-Keeper at St. James's, and terrifie the rest of Mankind from opening their Lips on his behalf.

The Preface

And must therefore Men and Books, like Dr. Bentley, and Dr. Bentley's Books, be run down meerly by noise and numbers? Shall Banter so securely Triumph over Learning, and Phrase and Confidence over Sense and Truth? Must Men of Worth (as I think, I have somewhere or other expressed it in the following Papers) be made the mock of Fools, because they that make them so write things so wretchedly trifling, that a Man who hath any regard to his own Reputation, would be ashamed of having so mis-employ'd his time as to answer them?

As 'twas this Consideration, and this only, drew me into this Dispute; so I must desire the Reader to consider, that 'tis not the Subject-matter of the following Lines which I recommend to his Observation, but the manner of these Gentlemens managing their Controversie with Dr. Bentley. And because it is scarce to be hoped that many should be found, who will give themselves the trouble of examining every particular, I shall point out some few Instances of our Vindicator's Allegations against the Dr. by which the Reader may give a guess at the whole, which upon Tryal I can assure him, he will find all of a piece. The chief Design of the Vindicator's Book, is to charge the Dr. with Plagiarism upon
account

to the Reader.

account of a certain MS. from whence it is pretended Dr. Bentley borrowed a great part of his Collection of the Fragments of Callimachus published in Mr. Grævius's late Edition of that Author, and put them off for his own. As I may pretend to have examined this part of his Accusation, more nicely than I can expect many others will do, I sincerely declare, that I see not the least Reason to believe, that the Dr's Collection was one line or hint the richer for his having seen that MS. The true State of the Controversie is given in the first Sheet and half, ending at page 23. To which, he that shall have the Curiosity of going to the Half-Moon and collating the Original Evidence it self there to be shewn against the Dr. is desired to add the Cautions laid down, page 51, &c. If he would without losing the time of going over the whole see some particular Exemplifications of our Vindicator's Ingenuity in prosecuting his Charge against the Dr. and of the Validity of his Proofs, he may consult these following Passages. Remark the first upon Proofs 6, 7. p. 25. and p. 33. 62, 63. 116, 117, 118. and especially, p. 79. 80. 81. 86. As for a choice Observation of our Vindicator's (though indeed not his own, but taken up at second hand from Mr. Boyle) upon the Extent of the Dr's Reading, I refer him

The Preface

to p. 37, &c. He that would take the measure of his Learning and Judgment, will find it, as in all his most judicious Animadversions upon the Dr's pretended mistakes, so more especially in these Observations of his own, p. 88, 89. 91, 92. 102, &c. and in his Supplement, p. 120, &c. 125. 128, &c. And here let me give (which was omitted in its proper place) the English of those two Greek Lines, pag. 89. by the help of which even the Wits and the Fools of Parts (who are indeed the support of the Cause) may be able, without the help of more Learning than what their Mother tongue affords them, to give some guess at the profundity of our Vindicator's Judgment, and how proper a Person he is to set up for a Corrector of other Men's Writings; Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος ἄνθρωπος ὅς τις ἐκείνῳ ἀντιτάξῃ. &c. According to Stephanus, and Dr. Bentley's Emendation in English thus. I also, as well as Pythagoras, command you to abstain from the feeding upon Beans, or the Flesh of any living Creature. But according to our Learned Vindicator's Correction thus. I also, as well as Pythagoras, command you to abstain from feeding upon Beans, and that you sit still without speaking a word.

As for the Clarity of our Honest Vindicator, his whole Book is one continued Proof of it. The very Design of his Book being

to the Reader.

being to prove; that the Dr. stole the best part of his Collection from their MS. But, He having perused and collated that MS. with the Dr's printed Collection, he could not but know this to be a most notorious Falshood. (vid. p. 64. 118.) And he that shall prefer an Indictment, the very Matter of which he knows to be false, cannot design Truth in his Proofs. But to point the Reader to one full, clear, and undeniable Proof of our Vindicator's Veracity, let him turn to pag. 114. line 15. Dr. Bentley to Conceal, &c. and his very next Allegation against the Dr. p. 115. is much of the same stamp.

As for the other part of his Accusation against the Dr. Dr. Bentley's Injustice and Inhumanity to the Authors that lived before him, I have dispatch'd the whole in so few words, that the perusing of it will be but little loss of time, p. 133. &c. Which when the Reader shall have done, to his own Judgment I leave it, whether I had not Reason to address my self to him in the manner I there do. P. 141.

" Observe it, Reader, and consider the
" Consequence; when once Banter hath
" broken in upon a Man's Reputation,
" how securely Ignorance will follow its
" Leader.

Mr.

The Preface

P. 133. *Mr. Bennet's Appendix being about that Matter of Fact, which hath fill'd the months of the Party with such Clamours, if any thing I have written shall find a Reader, I may presume it will be my Examination of that Appendix; to which therefore I shall not here say any more, than that I am even amazed at Mr. Bennet's Confidence in concluding his Appendix with so serious and solemn a Protestation, That those things were written by him with the same Sincerity, and Care as if he had been upon his Oath; that he had no where made use of any false Colours, nor willingly mislead his Reader in any the least trifling Circumstance of that tedious Story. Which, taking his words in the plain and natural Sense they seem to Design, I dare pronounce, to be a most notorious Falshood.*

And now upon the whole, after all the Pains these Gentlemen of the Half-Moon have taken upon the Dr. and his Writings, there is not, I think, any thing material advanced against him, either as to matter of Fact or matter of Learning, which hath not received a thorow Examination, that part of Mr. Boyle's Book excepted, which the Dr. hath reserved to his own farther Consideration; though I believe they could be very well content to dispense with him for the performance of his Promise. And

all

to the Reader.

all the black Accusations hitherto prefer'd
against him of Ignorance, Plagiarism,
Falshood, &c. appearing upon Tryal (as
I think they plainly do) both frivolous, false
and malicious: They may, if they please,
still go on with their laudable Design of
Printing things upon the Dr. and write a
Book against him once a Month as long
as he lives: I dare say, they will neither
give him any Disturbance in his own
Thoughts, nor injure his Reputation with
others. Since they stand already convicted
of so many notorious Prevarications; what-
soever they may hereafter advance, I shall
not scruple to pronounce that Reader, not
only Simple and Credulous, but also Partial
and Unjust, that shall trust them upon their
own bare words, or give any heed to the
most specious of their Pages till they have
stood a Tryal. And what I assume on the
behalf of the Dr. the same Priviledge I
think, I have a Right of claiming for my
self; who having shew'd my self so fearless
of their Displeasure, may reasonably expect
the worst of Revenges that the Pen can
execute: And as for any rougher Instru-
ment, I shall soon be placed out of their
reach.

V. Mr. B.
P. 220.

A. D-

ADVERTISEMENT.

LATELY publish'd The Epistles
of *Phalaris*, translated into English
from the Original, by the Author of this
ANSWER.

TO THE
 Author of the Remarks
 UPON
 Dr. Bentley's Fragments
 OF
 CALLIMACHUS.

S I R,

THAT part of your Book which I have now under consideration bears this Title.

An Honest Vindication of Tho. Stanley, Esquire, and his Notes on Callimachus. To which are added some other Observations on that Poet. In a Letter to the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esquire. With a Postscript, in relation to Dr. Bentley's late Book against him.

This Title promises two things.

First, *An Honest Vindication of Tho. Stanley, Esquire, and his Notes on Callimachus.*

Secondly, *Some other Observations on the same Poet.*

B

But

But withal here is special care taken to give the Reader notice of a certain *Postscript* in Relation to Dr. *Bentley's* late Book *against* Mr. *Boyle*: by which late Book of Dr. *Bentley against* Mr. *Boyle*, I understand the Doctor's late Book in Vindication of Himself, and his Dissertation upon the Epistles of *Phalaris* from the Objections made by the Honourable *Charles Boyle*, Esquire, *against* Both

Though 'tis your *Honest* Vindication of Mr. *Stanley* and his *Notes* on *Callimachus* I am principally concerned with: yet since you have been pleas'd to bless the world with some Things of your *Own*; Those your *own* Observations I shall separate from those of Mr. *Stanley*, and, to make them the more observed, present them to the view of the Reader in a place by themselves. And as for the *Postscript*, it will give me as little trouble, as I believe it did you.

P. 25. That the Vindication of the Dead, and speaking for them who cannot speak for themselves, is a Generous and Honourable Undertaking, I freely grant you. But if this *Vindication* of the Dead was wholly Unnecessary; if there was not the least manner of Injustice offered by Dr.

P. 74. *Bentley* to the *Manes* of Mr. *Stanley* requiring such a Vindication; the Doctor never omitting the mention of his Name, where there was just occasion for it, nor ever mentioning it without

Dr. *Bentley's Answer to Mr. Boyle*, pref. p. 93. p. 232. &c. ad fin. Malel. p. 45. the regard due to his Merit; if this your *Vindication* of the Dead be in reality nothing else than an *Accusation* of the Living, and that *Accusation* altogether frivolous, false and malicious; if upon due Examination this should appear to be the truth of the case: an indifferent Reader will be much tempted to doubt, whether or no in

in the whole management of this Affair you were indeed acted by those noble Principles you profess of Conscience, Honour, and Religion, and not rather put upon it by some very unjustifiable Motives of a quite different Nature. As perhaps the mean *view* of making your Court (though at the Expence both of your own Modesty, and your Neighbours Good Name) to a Young Gentleman, or the *vain-glorious* Ambition of falling in with a Triumphant Party and dividing with them the Spoils of an *already* (as you too soon thought) conquer'd Enemy.

Prof. p. 1,
2, and
P. 25, 76,
77.

P. 54.

But the Controversie in which I am engaged is too trifling to bear the Solemnity of an Introduction. I shall therefore without farther Ceremony forthwith enter into the Merits of the Cause; which I hope in not many words to dispatch with that Clearness and Evidence, that even you your self shall be willing to let the matter drop, and wish it had never been started.

To try the force of your Allegations against Dr. Bentley upon the account of Mr. Stanley's MS. I shall begin with the first of them, and under that plead to the whole Indictment.

Callimach.
op. Edit.
Grevian p.
305.
Vindicator.
p. 34.
Harpocrat.
Suidas.

" *Ἀντία ἀγών ἐς τὰ ἔξ* — as in Dr. Bentley, p. 305.
" *This Citation out of Suidas (which Mr. Stanley only hinted at) the Doctor hath transcribed and printed in words at length.*

These are your words. By the *Parenthesis* here (which Mr. Stanley only hinted at) is imply'd, I suppose, that if Mr. Stanley had not hinted at it, Dr. Bentley had not transcribed it.

Thus have you drawn up the Charge, which reduced into form lies thus.

The Citations out of Harpocraton and Suidas are in Mr. Stanley.

B 2

The

The Citations out of Harpocraton and Suidas are in Dr. Bentley: ergo,

Dr. Bentley stole the Citations out of Harpocraton and Suidas from Mr. Stanley.

Now of the self same stamp are all and every one of your Proofs that follow; as thus.

The Citations, Num. 2, 3, 7, 8, 12. and so of the rest, are in Mr. Stanley.

The Citations, Num. 2, 3, 7, 8, 12, &c. are in Dr. Bentley: ergo,

Dr. Bentley stole the Citations, Num. 2, 3, 7, 8, 12, &c. from Mr. Stanley.

Thus lies your Argument, nor can you say, but that I give it its whole force:

P. 76. And these are those *Proofs*, to which you give the *Epithet* of *Undeniable*, and upon which you pronounce the Doctor a *Convict* of *Notorious Plagiarism*. Were I minded to express my self

Mr. B. p.
259.

ingeniously upon this occasion, I could not do it in better words than in those of an *Approved Author*, for whom you doubtless have a particular Esteem. *Either our Vindicator must be a very Thoughtless Writer, or he must hope to meet with very Thoughtless Readers; and such I am sure they must be, if this way of arguing passes upon them.* Never was that bold *Epithet, Undeniable*, more miserably abused in the Press, or placed in a Post where it could less maintain its Ground. But it hath been the peculiar Happiness of some Books to meet with *very Thoughtless Readers*. Nor can I imagine what other Consideration could have given our *Honest Vindicator* also the Heart to set up for an Author. I could pinch you somewhat close upon this your *Undeniable*. But I scorn to take a weak Enemy at Advantage. That would be a Disparagement

ment

ment to the cause I have in hand: and Dr. Bentley might well think himself a man as unhappy in his Advocate, as he is happy in his Adversary, were this the best defence I could make for him; that your Proofs against him are *not* Undeniable. No, Sir, I'll freely abate you that strong word. If you can but make them, even to the lowest degree of Probability, *Probable*; I'll allow you a little heightning of your Stile, and you shall call them *Undeniable*.

Now the Probability of your Proofs depends upon the Probability of the *Supposition* upon which they stand: and that Supposition is this; That Dr. Bentley never met with those Citations which you charge upon him as stoln from Mr. Stanley's MS. either in the Authors themselves, in whose Names they are publish'd, or in any other Book whatsoever, save in your MS. For had he met with them any where else, he might as well have *transcribed* them from thence as from your MS. Now to suppose this reduces the *industrious* Dr. Bentley's *Polymathy* and *multifarious* Reading into a very narrow compass. Or else you must suppose, that though he might have met with them elsewhere, yet he would never have *observed* them, so as to have drawn them together, and presented them to the World in the manner he hath done, had he not found them readily collected to his hands by Mr. Stanley; which to prove will put you as hard to it as the former. This I think is a clear case. So that the Controversie depending between us is plainly this. Whether it be more probable that the Doctor should have both *seen* and *observed* those Citations in some other Books besides your MS. which is that part of

Mr. B. p.
101, &c.

Concess. 8,
9, intr.
p. 11, 12.

the Question I take. Or, whether it be more probable, that he had never *met* with them any where else, or never would have *observed* them, had not your MS. either presented him with them in words at length, or at least *directed* him to the Books where he might find them; which is the point you are to maintain.

Having thus, I think, very fairly and clearly stated the Case, and as much as possibly could be done to your advantage; let us calmly and deliberately argue it out. In the doing of which, for method sake, I shall proceed in this Order.

First, I shall produce your *own*, and your Friends *Concessions* on behalf of the Doctor.

Then I shall compare your *Concessions* with your *Assertions*, and from thence raise some just and reasonable Exceptions deeply affecting the whole Body of your Proofs. Which being, in the last place, applied to the particular instances, I shall think this Controversie at an end.

But this one thing I must observe to you before I go any farther, that hitherto I am but upon the *Defensive*, nor as yet any farther concerned in the Doctor's Interests, than barely to discharge him of the Accusation you bring against him; so that I am willing to stand upon the very *lowest* Terms with you, and shall be content to take up with that *indifferent* Account of the Doctor, which you and your Friends are pleased to give me, and make the best I can of it.

To begin therefore with your *Concessions*. And here I am forced to *Subpœna* in two or three Witnesses for the Doctor, whose Testimonies will be of so much the greater weight in
this

this cause, by how much the less they can be suspected of Partiality in his Favour. As for that Honourable Gentleman, whose name I must somewhat often make use of upon this occasion, considering how necessary his evidence is to me, and how ill I could have spared it, I hope he will the more readily pardon my presumption in producing it.

CONCESSION I.

Dr. Bentley is a Person of Singular Industry.

Witness 1. The Honourable Charles Boyle, Esquire, Examination of Dr. Bentley, p. 285.

And to give him my opinion, what He (sc. Dr. Bentley) is fit for, I think that the collecting of Greek Fragments and Proverbs would be a proper Employment for him.

And presently after, I am the rather apt to think, that such works as these might thrive in his hands, because the well executing them depends chiefly on two Qualities, which he must be allow'd to possess; Application and a Willingness to be employ'd in such sorts of Studies, as only load the Memory without improving the Understanding.

Witness 2. Honest Vindicator, p. 42. Notwithstanding his (sc. Dr. Bentley's) Accuracy and great Diligence in searching after the Fragments of Callimachus.

Witness 3. The Author of the Postscript to the Honest Vindication of Tho. Stanley, Esquire, lin. antepenult. I am neither afraid, nor ashamed to declare that I have a great Esteem for Dr. Bentley's Learning and Industry.

Next to *Industry*, in order to the carrying on any great design is required *Leisure*, and the opportunities of pursuing it. And that I think 'tis well known the Doctor's Circumstances have happily afforded him. But since we have an exprefs Testimony for it, I'll make that

CONCESSION II.

Dr. Bentley is a Person who hath enjoy'd Leisure and the other Opportunities of pursuing his Studies.

Witness Mr. Boyle, *Pref. p. 3.* where these words lin. 5. *The Person, who by the help of Leisure and Lexicons shall set up for a Critick*, are manifestly design'd as part of the Doctor's Character, *vide & p. 187, 189.* But how was this *Industry* and *Leisure* employ'd? why, which makes Concession the third.

CONCESSION III.

Dr. Bentley is a Person well read in Dictionary-Learning.

In turning over Greek *Vocabularies*, *Onomasticons*, *Etymologicons*, *Lexicons*, *Glossaries*, *Nomenclators* and *Scholia*.

Witness 1. Mr. Boyle, *loco jam dicto*, Concess. P. 197, & 2. and the places referr'd to in the Margin. But 208, 213, two of these *Lexicographers* are singled out from 223, 286, the rest, and therefore well deserve it, to have a particular mark set upon them, *sc. Suidas* and *Hesychius*.

1. With

1. *With Suidas the Doctor is very conversant,*
p. 197, and

2. *Hesychius is one of the great Store-houses*
of his Alphabetical-Learning, p. 183.

Witness 2. Honest Vindicator, p. 9. *A Vo-*
lume as big as the Lexicons he designs to publish.

And if he designs to publish them, surely he
must very thoroughly have Read them. *Confer*
cum Mr. B. p. 223.

Idem iterum, p. 33. *Dr. Bentley is the Man*
who hath sifted the Lexicographers and Scholi-
asts, both printed and in MS.

Witness 3. One A. Alsop late Batchelor of
Arts of *Christ-Church* College in the University
of *Oxford*, Prefat. to his *Fabularum Æsopica-*
rum Delectus Gr. Lat. è *Theatro Sheldoniano*,
1698, lin. 3, 4 **RICHARDUM** quendam
BENTLEIUM virum in voluendis Lexicis sa-
tis Diligentem, i. e. One Richard Bentley, a
Man Diligent enough at turning over Lexicons.
For this Sir *Alsop's* Richardum quendam Bentlei-
um, I take to be the very self same Person, whom
Mr. Boyle, p. 195, more respectfully styles *Rich-*
ard Bentley, Doctor of Divinity, and Chaplain
in Ordinary to his Majesty: and that *R. Bentley*,
D. D. is most certainly *Mr. Grævius's* **RICH-**
ARDUS BENTLEIUS *Potentissimo Regi*
GULIELMO à Bibliothecâ, novum sed splen-
didissimum Britannia Lumen, i. e. **RICHARD**
BENTLEY, that New but Brightest Star of
Britain, Keeper of the Library to the most Po-
tent King *WILLIAM*.

CON-

CONCESSION IV.

Dr. Bentley is well vers'd in the Indexes of Books.

P. 68, 145, 165. *Witness 1. Mr. Boyle in the places referr'd to in the Margin, and more especially that Quotation out of Quintilian, as apply'd to Dr. Bentley. Nec sanè quisquam est tam procul à cognitione eorum remotus, ut non Indicem certè ex Bibliothecâ sumptum transferre in Libros suos possit:* which words it was designed, I suppose, we should understand to this purpose. *No man can be so great a Dunce, but that by turning to Indexes in a Library he may collect Authorities in abundance,* p. 68. Confer cum *Dr. B's Answer,* p. 421.

Witness 2. Honest Vindicator, p. 83. — Har- duin, whose Indexes directed Dr. Bentley to those Quotations, sc. out of Pliny.

CONCESSION V.

Quotation was once thought the Doctor's peculiar Province; and particularly the Quoting things lying out of the common way of Reading.

And if *once* so, I see no reason why his *after* Performances should sink his Reputation upon that Account.

Witness Mr. Boyle. I thought Quotation had been the Doctor's peculiar Province, p. 29. Confer cum *Dr. B's Answer,* p. 5, & 13.

Idem,

Idem, p. 45. *As much out of the way as the Doctor loves to read*; and p. 226. *The Doctor is one that distinguishes himself, by finding out Hints in the odd Corners of Books, where'tis probable, no body else would look for them.*

CONCESSION VI.

Dr. Bentley consults the severall Editions of Books.

Witness Mr. Boyle, *to consult the several Editions, to collate the MSS, to turn over Dictionaries*, p. 223. This is spoken of Dr. Bentley.

CONCESSION VII.

Dr. Bentley is presumed to have read all Authors in Critick.

Witness 1. *Honest Vindicator*, p. 38. *in the words now named.*

Witness 2. Mr. Boyle, *a man of the Doctor's Polymathy, and great Reading*, p. 101, 23, & al.

CONCESSION VIII.

In reading the Ancients, Dr. Bentley digests his Observations and Collections into the method of Common-place.

Witness Mr. Boyle. For so I suppose he would have us understand him, when p. 27. he joyns *Stobæus* and *Suidas* together, *the one an eminent Common-Placer, the other a no less eminent*

nent Dictionary-Writer, as the two sorts of men for whom the Doctor hath a particular Regard, q.d. the Doctor hath no less a Talent at Commonplacing than he hath at Dictionary-making. Confer cum p. 223.

CONCESSION IX.

Dr. Bentley had long since formed a Design of Collecting the Fragments of all the Greek Poets.

How long since to a point of time we cannot tell. That he had not onely formed the Design, but made considerable Progress in it before the year 91, is certain.

Witness 1. Mr. Boyle, p. 194, where he quotes, and by building an argument upon it, subscribes to the following passage out of the Doctor's Letter to Dr. Mill, printed at the end of Malela, Anno 1691, p. 20. Nam in his rebus verba mihi dari haud facile patior; qui, ut scis, fragmenta omnium poetarum Græcorum cum Emendationibus ac notis, grande opus, edere constitueram. In which words (as Mr. Boyle truly and fairly represents the meaning of them) the Doctor boldly declares his opinion of himself that he thought he could not easily be deceived in knowing whether a Greek Verse were ascribed to its proper Author, and that because he once had it in his intentions to have published the Fragments of all the Greek Poets, with Emendations and Notes upon them; which, should he have finished it, would have made a large Work.

Nor had he formed the design only, but made considerable Progress in it. Witness the many
pre-

pregnant Instances of it in the fore-named *Epist. ad fin. Malel.* and more particularly the *Specimen* there given upon the *Tragic Poet Iön*, p. 50, & seqq. and Mr. Boyle's own Confession, p. 285. In one of these (sc. the collecting of Greek Fragments) he hath succeeded well.

Witness 2. *Honest Vindicator*, who, p. 94, calls the Collecting Greek Fragments, the Doctor's old beloved Studies.

CONCESSION X.

Dr. Bentley hath been Critically exact in Correcting the Fragments of Callimachus.

Witness *Honest Vindicator*, p. 42. Notwithstanding his Accuracy, his great Diligence in searching after the Fragments of *Callimachus*, and strictness in Correcting the Failures of others.

CONCESSION XI.

Dr. Bentley hath made some Additions of his own to Mr. Stanley's MS.

Witness *Honest Vindicator* in the place just now referr'd to, p. 42. It ought to be confest that *Dr. Bentley hath made some Additions of his own, to what was collected to his hands so readily.* And p. 33. It ought to be acknowledged that *Dr. Bentley hath made some Additions to Mr. Stanley's Collections; and it must have been a Prodigy, if a Man, who has sifted the old Lexicographers and Scholiasts both Printed and in MS, should not have found out some Passages, which had escaped*

ped the Diligence of that Learned Gentleman; of whose Notes it must be observed, That they are an imperfect Draught of a more complete work.

Mr. Stanley's MS. being but an imperfect Draught of a more compleat work; from a Man who had sifted the Lexicographers and Scholiasts both Printed and in MS, and sifted them with a design of Collecting the Fragments, of all the Greek Poets, one might reasonably have expected Additions deserving a better Title than that Diminutive Epithet *SOME*; *SOME* Additions, *sc.* some few inconsiderable ones, here and there an odd Quotation. So cautiously do you express your self. But as I am as yet upon the receiving hand, I must content my self with what you are pleased to give me, onely desiring of you, that what you here not over liberally grant, you would not elsewhere retract, but still allow these *some* Additions to be the Doctor's *own*.

I shall make bold to borrow of you yet one Concession more, in which, though the Doctor be not immediately concerned, yet it will be of some use to me in the managing of his Cause. And that is this.

CONCESSION XII.

That besides what had been formerly printed upon this Author, the Illustrious Spanheim hath done some service to Callimachus both in his Collection of Fragments, and in an entire Volume of Learned Annotations upon that Poet; hand in hand, with whose Collection Dr. Bentley's Collection appears, and in multiplied Instances concurs.

Wit-

Witness *Honest Vindicator*, p. 32. in the words here express'd.

Thus have I gained of you a competent number of *Concessions*, with which I am got up to the very Throat of the Cause, and have little more to do now, than to sum up the Evidence, and apply it to the matter in hand. And if you do not by this time apprehend the danger which threatens all your *Undeniabes*, you are a person of that happy Constitution, which renders a man secure and fearless.

Dr. Bentley is a Person of singular Industry and Application, and by the very make of his Nature particularly addicted to *these sorts of Studies*, upon which he is now called into Question: hath met with the most encouraging opportunities of pursuing them: Is extremely well vers'd in the old *Lexicographers*; Nor less familiar with the *Scholiasts*: Knows no man better how to make his Advantage of an Index: Quotation is his peculiar Province: When he reads an ancient Author, Greek or Latin, is for consulting the several Editions of him, and Collating the MSS: Is a man of vast Polymathy, and presumed to have read all Authors in Critick: Digests his *Lectiōs* and *Observations* into the method of Common-place: Had long since formed the design of Collecting the Fragments of all the Greek Poets: Hath been critically exact in correcting those of *Callimachus* in particular: hath made some Additions of his own to Mr. Stanley's Collection: Was in this work of Collecting the Fragments of *Callimachus*, as preceded by *Vulcanius* and *Dacier*, so accompanied with his Excellency *Spanhemius*; Hand

ped the Diligence of that Learned Gentleman; of whose Notes it must be observed, That they are an imperfect Draught of a more complete work.

Mr. Stanley's MS. being but an *imperfect Draught of a more compleat work*; from a Man who had *sifted the Lexicographers and Scholiasts both Printed and in MS*, and *sifted* them with a design of Collecting the Fragments of all the Greek Poets, one might reasonably have expected *Additions* deserving a better Title than that *Diminutive Epithet SOME; SOME Additions*, *sc.* some few inconsiderable ones, here and there an odd Quotation. So *cautiously* do you express your self. But as I am as yet upon the receiving hand, I must content my self with what you are pleased to give me, onely desiring of you, that what you here not over liberally grant, you would not elsewhere retract, but still allow these *some Additions* to be the Doctor's *own*.

I shall make bold to borrow of you yet one *Concession* more, in which, though the Doctor be not immediately concerned, yet it will be of some use to me in the managing of his Cause. And that is this.

CONCESSION XII.

That besides what had been formerly printed upon this Author, the Illustrious Spanheim hath done some service to Callimachus both in his Collection of Fragments, and in an entire Volume of Learned Annotations upon that Poet; hand in hand, with whose Collection Dr. Bentley's Collection appears, and in multiplied Instances concurs.

Wit-

Witness *Honest Vindicator*, p. 32. in the words here express'd.

Thus have I gained of you a competent number of *Concessions*, with which I am got up to the very Throat of the Cause, and have little more to do now, than to summ up the Evidence, and apply it to the matter in hand. And if you do not by this time apprehend the danger which threatens all your *Undeniables*, you are a person of that happy Constitution, which renders a man secure and fearless.

Dr. *Bentley* is a Person of singular *Indu-*
stry and *Application*, and by the very make
of his Nature particularly addicted to *these*
sorts of Studies, upon which he is now cal-
led into Question: hath met with the most
encouraging opportunities of pursuing them:
Is extremely well vers'd in the old *Lexicographers*;
Nor less familiar with the *Scholiasts*: Knows no
man better how to make his Advantage of an
Index: *Quotation* is his peculiar Province:
When he reads an ancient Author, *Greek* or
Latin, is for consulting the several Editions of
him, and Collating the MSS: Is a man of vast
Polymathy, and *presumed to have read all Authors*
in Critick: Digests his *Lectures* and *Observati-*
ons into the method of Common-place: Had
long since formed the design of Collecting the
Fragments of *all the Greek Poets*: Hath been
critically exact in correcting those of *Callimachus*
in particular: hath made *some* Additions of his
own to Mr. *Stanley's* Collection: Was in this
work of Collecting the Fragments of *Callima-*
chus, as preceded by *Vulcanius* and *Dacier*, so
accompanied with his Excellency *Spanhemius*;
Hand

Hand in hand with whose Collection the Dr's Collection appears, and in multiplied Instances concurs. All which notwithstanding, after all this *Industry* and *Leisure*; so employ'd as is before described, and upon a design so long since formed: this self same Dr. *Bentley* is a most *notorious Plagiary*. But how so? why *because* Mr. *Stanley* also had fallen upon the same design of Collecting the Fragments of *Callimachus*, and had made some little Beginnings in the work, an *imperfect Draught* of which is still preserved: and this *imperfect Draught* of Mr. *Stanley's* Collections the Doctor had the *Misfortune* to have put into his hands; and in this *imperfect Draught* there are (in a considerable number of Instances) the same *Quotations*, and (in *some* very few) the same *Corrections* as are in the Doctor's more *finished Piece*. Building upon this, you conclude your work is done, and to place the matter beyond Dispute, invite the Reader to

P. 32. Mr. *Benner's* Shop in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, where he will see the self same words and *Syllables* in Mr. *Stanley's Manuscript* as in Dr. *Bentley's* printed Collection. This seems so fair an

P. 76. Appeal that the unwary Reader is presently taken with it. For what farther satisfaction would one desire in such a case than Ocular Demonstration? What fuller Conviction than so apparent *matter of fact*? All which notwithstanding, I shall not scruple to pronounce that Reader very *Thoughtless* upon whom this way of arguing shall pass for *Demonstration*. For both Mr. *Stanley* and the Doctor having fallen upon the same Thought of Collecting the Fragments of *Callimachus*, that there should be some of the same *Quotations* in the one as in the other

ther is so far from being a *convictive* Evidence of the Latter's having *Transcribed* them from the Former, that the nature of the thing renders it impossible to have been otherwise : unless we must suppose some strange chance so to have divided the course of their Reading, that they should not so much as have dipt into the same Books. For if they both read the same Authors, and both with a design of collecting the same *Fragments* ; it is impossible, but that so far as from the time of their having enter'd upon that Design, they kept pace with each other in the course of the Reading, they must also (allowing for here and there an oversight) have transferred into their Collections the same Quotations. And had Mr. Stanley carry'd on his work farther, Dr. Bentley's Collection must also of necessity, though without his ever having seen Mr. Stanley's, have fallen in with it oftner than now it doth, and his *some* Additions, as you call them, have been proportionably fewer than now they are. So that (to remind you of the state of the question) to make good your Accusation of *Plagiarism* against Dr. Bentley upon the account of Mr. Stanley's MS. one of these two points ought to have been more particularly insisted upon ; either that Mr. Stanley's Collection was a very complete one, those *some* Additions of the Doctor's being but few and inconsiderable in comparison of what he is supposed to have found readily Collected to his hands by Mr. Stanley ; the direct contrary to which is the truth of the case : Or else, that those other *some* Quotations, which you charge upon him as borrow'd from Mr. Stanley, were such chosen pieces, and lying so much out of the way of

C

the

Sup. p. 5.

the Doctor's Reading, that he would certainly have miss'd of them, had he not found them in your MS. of which I say the same as of the former; the Citations of Mr. Stanley's MS. being the most easily come at of any in the whole Set, and lying so full in the Doctor's daily walks, that he could not but have stumbled upon them, even whether he would or no. And yet you run on from the beginning to the end upon your wild and groundless *Supposition*, which you take for granted, without offering ~~one~~ Syllable in proof of it, That the Doctor had never met with those Citations any where else, or never *observed* them, till he lit upon them in your MS. This is that grand *Supposition* which supports all your Proofs: which therefore, when upon a Review of the Concessions before laid down, you shall see so miserably betray'd, you will find cause to blame your own Incircumspection, and wish you had been more sparing of your Complements.

And now Sir, as for the Promise which I made you of a comparison between your *Concessions* and your *Assertions*; I think I may save my self that labour, and leave it to the Reader from what hath been already said to collect how far those Liberal *Encomiums* bestow'd upon the Doctor for his Industry, and the several other peculiarities of his character, so happily qualifying him for Undertakings of this nature, will go to discharge him of the foul Imputation of *Plagiarism*; and how inconsistent the one part of the character you give us of him is with the other part of it.

'Tis not for that the necessity of the cause requires this Precaution and Exactness, that I am thus

thus grave, and (if I may so say) *Mathematical* in making my *Approaches* to the Argument, but out of the respect I bear to your person, whom being altogether unknown to me, I would not willingly Affront; which construction might be made of it, should I answer your Suggestions in so slighty and superficial a manner, as if they did not deserve a more thorow Consideration. And besides, those so *Emphatick* terms in which you press on your Accusation upon the Doctor, will plead my excuse, if I be at more pains than otherwise could have been judged necessary to bestow upon it so *serious* and *operose* a Reply. *Undeniable Proof, Ocular Demonstration, matter of Fact, Manifest Conviction*: These, sure, are too weighty things to be pass'd over with a loose Harangue. The nature of your Evidence in general, I think hath been already sufficiently consider'd. I proceed now in due form and manner to lay in (which was the next thing propos'd) my *Exceptions* against your *Proofs* in particular. All your Allegations therefore against the Doctor I admit to pass for good Evidence, (or if you will have it so) *Undeniable Proofs*; those only which fall under these *Exceptions* following, excepted.

Exception I.

The several Passages taken out of the old *Lexi- Supr. p. 8.*
cographers and *Scholiasts*: with whom the Do- & *seqq.*
 ctor being so familiarly acquainted, cannot be
 supposed to have overlooked those *Quotations*
 with which those Authors must needs have sup-
 ply'd him.

Exception II.

The Passages mark'd out in the *Indexes* of Books. For the Doctor being *presumed* to be so well vers'd in *Indexes*, cannot be *presumed*, when he was upon Collecting the *Fragments* of *Callimachus* to have been at a loss for such of them, as those *Indexes* would most readily have directed him to.

Exception III.

Antw.

1584, 12°.

Paris,

1675, 4°.

The several *Fragments* or *Testimonia* relating to *Callimachus* extant in *Vulcanius* and *Dacier's* Editions of that Author. For the Passages there extant the Doctor, whose practice it is to *consult the several Editions of Books*, must needs have seen: which yet make up a considerable part of the instances you produce against him, as *Proofs* of his *Plagiarism* from your MS.

Exception IV.

*In Ep. ad
fin. Malel.*

Those Quotations which the Doctor had actually printed *before* ever he saw your MS. or which are taken from Authors with whom it plainly appears he was *before* then very familiarly acquainted.

Exception V.

Those Citations or Corrections in which Mr. *Stanley's* Collection, Mr. *Spanheim's*, and the Doctor's concur. For if Mr. *Spanheim* could *without* the help of your MS. light upon many

many of the same things which are in your MS. Why, might not Dr. Bentley do the like? unless we must suppose the Doctor to have been less diligent in searching after the Fragments of Callimachus, or less curious in correcting the failures of others: which both your own words, and the plain matter of Fact (as will appear to any one that shall compare the Doctor's Collection with any of the other Collections printed together with his) manifestly confutes.

Exception VI.

Such Passages which are not to be met with in any Book whatsoever, whether printed or MS. save only in Mr. Stanley's Collection. For the Doctor taking such delight in Quotation, having been so long upon this Collecting Design, Treasuring up his Collections into Common-place, being presumed to have read all Authors in Critick, spending his time in turning over old MSS, and fetching his Quotations out of the odd Corners of Books, where scarce any body else would look for them: I cannot imagin what One of all your Proofs may be presumed to have escaped so Diligent a Search; unless produced out of some such Books, whether printed or MS, which the Doctor never had the Possibility of seeing.

Exception VII.

And lastly, I except also out of the number of Proofs those few Corrections in which Mr. Stanley's Manuscript Collection, and the Doctor's printed one concur, though not to be

shewn in any Book in the world, saving in those two. For the Doctor having been so *Critically exact in correcting the Fragments of Callimachus*, and having proved the exactness of his Judgment upon so many difficult places untouch'd by Mr. Stanley, he cannot reasonably be presumed to have over-look'd those other so manifestly corrupt *Lectiōs*, which no * man that understood any thing belonging to *Callimachus*, could have pass'd by unobserv'd; nay, which any School-Boy, that had but Grammar enough to scan a Greek Verse, would have † rectified. And of this kind are most (if not all) of those Corrections, which you charge upon him as stoln from Mr. Stanley. Though both Mr. Stanley's and Dr. Bentley's Talent at *these sort of Studies* being well known, it had been no such strange *jumping of Wits*, if they had in more Instances of this kind hit upon the same Conjectures: which yet they have so rarely done (and then only in places of the most obvious Emendation) that there was no need of laying in this *Caveat*.

And thus much for the *Exceptions* I had to make against your Proofs, all of them founded upon your own *Concessions*; which you cannot in honour retract: though indeed you have given little more than what I might honestly have assumed for the Doctor without becoming your Debtor. But since you were so over and above obliging, I was willing to close in with you upon your own Terms. Especially most of those things being delivered with such a peculiar Gracefulness and Decency of *Stile*, which my unpractis'd Pen could never have attain'd to. Nor can you now say, that I have any-where abused

* As that of *Αιχάλη* for *Εχάλη*, n. 52. v. *Spanhemii fragm.* p. 278.

† As that of *Νενδεν* for *Νενδεν*, n. 49.

abused or misrepresented you, having all along recited your own Words and Syllables, put no forc'd Interpretation upon them; nor charged them with consequences which they do not naturally bear. And 'tis but agreeable to the Law of Arms, if one can make ones self Master of the Enemy's Artillery, to turn it upon themselves: and if your Testimonies *for* the Doctor must be of no weight; 'Tis a most unequitable demand, that your Testimonies *against* him should be of greater. So that till you can produce some *such* Proofs as will not fall under some or other of these *Exceptions*, the Doctor may still be, for all his having seen your MS, as free from the Crime of *Plagiarism* as the man that never saw it.

There are some sorts of Transactions, wherein the Preliminaries rightly adjusted, the whole Affair is soon brought to a Conclusion: of which kind I take to be our present Controversie. The Reader, who understands any thing of the nature of the Subject we are upon, cannot but by this time begin to perceive how the case stands between the Doctor and your MS. and where things are like to end. I must however, were it only for form sake, enter into the *Detail of particulars*, which I shall do in this method.

First, I shall take some *Decads* of your Proofs just in order as they lie, and try them by the Rules before given, subjoyning to them at convenient Distances, some proper *Remarks*, which added to those general Observations already made, you will have no cause to think your self neglected, or complain that I have done my work but by halves. And by that I shall have taken this course with three or four *Decads* of

your Proofs (for they are a great number of them in all) I shall presume upon it, that both you and my Reader will be well enough content I should hold my hand, and dispatch the rest of them by whole-sale. To place things under an easie view to the Eye, I must make use of two of the Letters of the Alphabet, the one to represent (as it were) the Plaintiff, and head the *Allegations*, the other to represent the Defendant, and *father* the *Replications*. The former shall be V. standing for *Vindicator*, the other, from its order in the *Alphabet*, W.

The First Decad of Proofs.

Proof 1.

V. The Citation out of *Harpocraton*, *Ἀκτία ἀγων καὶ τὰ ἕξ*— as in Dr. Bentley, p 305. n. 1.

W. And as in Mr. Spanheim, p. 293. n. 11. *Exception 5.* Harpocraton is a Lexicographer. *Exception 1.* 'Tis marked out in the Index to Harpocraton. *Exc. 2.*

L. B. 1683.
4to.

Pr. 2.

V. The same Citation out of *Suidas*, *ibid.*
W. With *Suidas* the Doctor is very conversant, Conc. 3. *Exc. 1.*

Pr. 3.

V. An Epigram out of *Martial*, n. 2.
W. In *Dacier's Callimachus* inter Testimonia Veterum, *Exc. 3.*

Pr. 4.

V. The Citation out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, n. 2.
W. Index to Clem. Alex. *Exc. 2.*

V. Ano-

V. Another of the same, n. 3.

Pr. 5.

W. *Index again.*

V. Two Citations out of *Didymus* upon *Homer*, n. 5. 6. Pr. 6, 7.

W. *Not Proofs.*

V. A Quotation out of *Servius* upon *Virgil*, n. 7. Pr. 8.

W. *Index to Servius upon Virgil*, Exc. 2. 4to, 1648.

V. Another of the same, n. 8.

Pr. 9.

W. *Index again.*

V. A Citation out of *Stobæus*, n. 11.

Pr. 10.

W. *Index again*, Exc. 2. in *Vulcanius his Callimachus*, p. 138. or in *Dacier's* p. 152. Exc. 3.

Remarks upon Decad I.

Leaving the rest of your *Proofs* to answer for *Remark 1.* themselves to the several *Exceptions* clap'd upon the back of them ; two of them there are of so *peculiar a Complexion*, that I cannot but make a stop at them, *sc. Pr. 6, 7. The two Citations out of the Scholiast upon Homer, Dr. B. fr. n. 5, 6. To which I returned no other Answer than Not Proofs.* Which whether it were sufficient let the Reader judge from what follows. With them therefore I begin my Remarks.

Remark I.

Putting your sense into words at length, and making it intelligible, you alledge them in this
Form

P. 35. Form. From Parrhasius, to whom the Doctor is refer'd by Mr. Stanley's MS. he had his Information that the Scholiast upon Homer often cited the *Ætia* of Callimachus. From whence the Inference is; ergo, Dr. Bentley stole his two Citations out of *Didymus* upon *Homer*, n. 5, 6. from Mr. Stanley's MS. But how so? Are they in your MS? No, not so. But Mr. Stanley directed him to *Janus Parrhasius*, and so he came by them. To *Janus Parrhasius* therefore I go, and by the help of *Gruter's Index* to the first Volume of his *Fax Artium*, I readily turn to the place you intend, and there, p. 874. I find these words, *Ex Ætiis præterea Callimachi vetustus & innominatus interpres Homeri, qui in Publica Vaticana Bibliotheca Romæ legitur, sæpissimè testimonium petit*, i. e. "There is to be
 " seen in the *Vatican Library* at *Rome*, an old
 " nameless *Scholiast* upon *Homer*, who often
 " quotes *Callimachus's Artia*. And this is every word that *Parrhasius* says to the matter. And now let us see how deeply the Doctor is indebted to your MS. upon the account of these two Quotations. Just thus much and no more. Mr. Stanley, he sends him to *Parrhasius*; and *Parrhasius*, he sends him to *Rome*, telling him withall, that 'twas but going into the *Vatican Library*, and enquiring there for a certain old nameless *Scholiast* upon *Homer*; and so, if he had the luck to hit upon the right Book, he would meet with somewhat to his purpose in it: And so the Doctor came by his two Citations out of *Didymus*. An Information much like that which the old man in the Fable gave to his Son of a Treasure buried under ground in the Vineyard, but not telling him the place where, the young
 Heir

Heir was fain to dig the Vineyard all over, and so he found his Treasure indeed, not what he expected, Pots of Money, but what his Father designed, the fruit of good Husbandry. After the same manner, the Dr. having (by the help of your MS.) heard somewhat of an old *Scholiast* upon *Homer*, that quoted somewhat out of *Callimachus* his *Ætia*, was resolv'd, whatever it was, and whatever pains it cost him, he would have it. But that *Scholiast* upon *Homer* being a nameless one, least he should not hit upon the right, he turns over all the *Scholiasts* upon *Homer*: and so he gets not only these three Citations belonging to *Callimachus* his *Ætia* (for there's another of them to follow in the next *Decad*) but about half an Hundred more some way or other belonging to the same Author: but all by the help of your MS. which first put him upon the Quest. For had not your MS. sent him to *Janus Parrhasius*, the Doctor had never thought of any of the old *Scholiasts* upon *Homer*. But to be serious with you, Sir; would you have offer'd such things as these for *Proofs* against the Doctor, but upon the presumption that no body would have been at the pains of tracing you? The Doctor is a *Notorious Plagiary*. And why? why, *because* the Doctor hath three Quotations out of *Didymus* upon *Homer*, referring to *Callimachus* his *Ætia*; and before the Doctor had printed his *Fragments*, he had seen Mr. *Stanley's* MS; and Mr. *Stanley's* MS. takes notice of *Parrhasius*, who takes notice of an old *Scholiast* upon *Homer*, who takes notice of *Callimachus* his *Ætia*, ergo Dr. *Bentley* is a Plagiary. A surprizing Consequence! But, Sir, before you can bring this Proof to bear, there
may

P. 35. Form. From Parrhasius, to whom the Doctor is refer'd by Mr. Stanley's MS. he had his Information that the Scholiast upon Homer often cited the *Ætia* of Callimachus. From whence the Inference is; ergo, Dr. Bentley stole his two Citations out of *Didymus* upon *Homer*, n. 5, 6. from Mr. Stanley's MS. But how so? Are they in your MS? No, not so. But Mr. Stanley directed him to *Janus Parrhasius*, and so he came by them. To *Janus Parrhasius* therefore I go, and by the help of *Gruter's Index* to the first Volume of his *Fax Artium*, I readily turn to the place you intend, and there, p. 874. I find these words, *Ex Ætiis præterea Callimachi vetustus & innominatus interpres Homeri, qui in Publica Vaticana Bibliotheca Romæ legitur, sæpissimè testimonium petit, i. e.* " There is to be " seen in the *Vatican Library* at *Rome*, an old " nameless *Scholiast* upon *Homer*, who often " quotes *Callimachus's Artia*. And this is every word that *Parrhasius* says to the matter. And now let us see how deeply the Doctor is indebted to your MS. upon the account of these two Quotations. Just thus much and no more. Mr. Stanley, he sends him to *Parrhasius*; and *Parrhasius*, he sends him to *Rome*, telling him withall, that 'twas but going into the *Vatican Library*, and enquiring there for a certain old nameless *Scholiast* upon *Homer*; and so, if he had the luck to hit upon the right Book, he would meet with somewhat to his purpose in it: And so the Doctor came by his two Citations out of *Didymus*. An Information much like that which the old man in the Fable gave to his Son of a Treasure buried under ground in the Vineyard, but not telling him the place where, the young
Heir

Heir was fain to dig the Vineyard all over, and so he found his Treasure indeed, not what he expected, Pots of Money, but what his Father designed, the fruit of good Husbandry. After the same manner, the Dr. having (by the help of your MS.) heard somewhat of an old *Scholiast* upon *Homer*, that quoted somewhat out of *Callimachus* his *Ætia*, was resolv'd, whatever it was, and whatever pains it cost him, he would have it. But that *Scholiast* upon *Homer* being a nameless one, least he should not hit upon the right, he turns over all the *Scholiasts* upon *Homer*: and so he gets not only these three Citations belonging to *Callimachus* his *Ætia* (for there's another of them to follow in the next *Decad*) but about half an Hundred more some way or other belonging to the same Author: but all by the help of your MS. which first put him upon the Quest. For had not your MS. sent him to *Janus Parrhasius*, the Doctor had never thought of any of the old *Scholiasts* upon *Homer*. But to be serious with you, Sir; would you have offer'd such things as these for *Proofs* against the Doctor, but upon the presumption that no body would have been at the pains of tracing you? The Doctor is a *Notorious Plagiary*. And why? why, *because* the Doctor hath three Quotations out of *Didymus* upon *Homer*, referring to *Callimachus* his *Ætia*; and before the Doctor had printed his *Fragments*, he had seen Mr. *Stanley's* MS; and Mr. *Stanley's* MS. takes notice of *Parrhasius*, who takes notice of an old *Scholiast* upon *Homer*, who takes notice of *Callimachus* his *Ætia*, ergo Dr. Bentley is a Plagiary. A surprizing Consequence! But, Sir, before you can bring this Proof to bear, there
may

may be made several *Queries*, to which it behooves you to give a punctual Answer. As do you think the Doctor would never have look'd into *Didymus* upon *Homer*, had it not been for this special *Information*, which at second hand he received from your MS? Or would not *Gruter's Index*, which *literâ C.* hath these words, *Callimachi Ætia, quo argumento Parrhas. p. 873.* have sent him as strait to *Parrhasius* as your MS. could have done? Or are you sure that *Parrhasius* his old nameless *Scholiast* of the *Vatican* was ever yet committed to the Press? or that *Didymus* was it? For there are several old *Scholiasts* upon *Homer* both printed and in MS. As besides *Eustathius* and *Didymus*, whom every body hath heard of, *Gruter's Index* to the 5th Volume of his *Criticks* refers me to *H. Stephani Schediasmata, lib. 4. c. 21.* where I find mention of *Quædam in Homerum Scholia, quæ nondum edita sunt, & quæ quàm paucissimis legere datur.* In the Epistle printed at the end of *Malela's* Chronology, p. 63. I find the Doctor himself quoting *Joannes Tzetzes* his *Ilias interpretata Allegorice, quæ nondum edita est.* And in num. 135. of this his Collection, I find him producing a Fragment of *Callimachus* with a large Quotation out of *Porphyrus in Homericis Questionibus.* And these indeed have been printed over and over, but in *Holstenius* his Notes upon *Porphyrus's* Life of *Pythagoras* you will find mention of other old *Scholia* upon *Homer*, bearing also the name of *Porphyrus*, which have never been yet printed. And other old MS. *Scholia* upon *Homer* undoubtedly there are in the world more than either you, or I, or the Dr. or Mr. *Stanley*, or *Parrhasius*, or any one man else whatsoever

ever may have seen. Now to which of all these did *Parrhasius* send the Doctor? To that which is now known by the name of *Didymus* you suppose, but it might be to any other *nameless Scholiast* as well as to him. I might farther ask you, Sir, how many Quotations out of all or any one of these *Scholiasts* are there in your MS? In the Doctor's Collection, taking them all together, there are (for I have been at the pains of counting them) above half an hundred Quotations out of the old *Scholiasts* upon *Homer*. As far as you have carried on the comparison, I find not so much as one single reference directly out of your MS. to any one of all these *Scholiasts*, and therefore very much question, whether in the drawing up this *Imperfect Draught* Mr. *Stanley* made any use of any one of them. And yet by a strange fetch these three *Quotations* must be stole from your MS. But if he came by these three by the help of your MS. how came he by the other half hundred? were they from your MS too? a *compendious* way of making him as *Notorious* a *Plagiary* as you please. For you might as well have charged him with the whole as with part. And do such *Proofs* as these deserve a better answer than what I gave them? *Not Proofs*, nor any thing like *Proofs*, but mere Suggestion, and altogether groundless. And now as for that *Sentence* out of *Parrhasius* with which, as it were by way of *Epiphonema*, you back these two *Proofs*, and by the help of which translated into *English*, you call the Doctor *Plagiary* in two Languages, I have no more to say to it, than that I believe the *Translation* to be your *own*: which is more than I dare venture to say for that choice piece
of

of an *Æsopick*, which adorns your Title-page. There seems to be too much of the Spirit and Stile in that for a person of your Gravity and Seriousness. I am almost as confident as if I had seen the hand that did it; that in your *Title-page* and *Postscript* you had the assistance of some Second. 'Twas pity he did not take the same care of you throughout your whole Book. Your *Stile* stood in great need of mending. I fear I have already detained the Reader too long upon this particular. But I was willing to let him see how resolved you were to make the most of your Cause. And Remark the second, as for another instance of your plain dealing, and a bold stroke of the Pen, he'll find not at all inferior to the first; but (as to the former part of it at least) of a more general Concern.

Remark II.

Just after the *Titulus* *Atria*, you have these words. " *The two Epigrams out of the Anthology are omitted by Mr. Stanley, with which the Doctor makes a flourish; but the Epigram out of Martial is in Mr. Stanley's Collections. With which the Doctor makes a flourish.*

Which the Doctor quotes you mean; for the one of which he produces a fresh *Authority*, and upon the other of which he bestows a *Correction*. This is all the *flourish* the Dr. makes with them; and this is the Dr's way of making a *flourish*: scarce any thing passes through *his* hands, but he leaves it better than he found it. Nor can you your self forbear now and then offering at such kind of *flourishes*: with what success we shall see

see in its proper place. But whether the Doctor *hath* the same things with your MS. or hath *not* the same things; something must be said to him. I might also ask you, since we are *here* allow'd to suppose the Doctor to have fought these two *Greek Epigrams* out of the *Anthology* it self, why may we not also suppose him to have fought *Martial's Epigram* out of *Martial* himself? Is it because *Martial* is a *common Book*, and the Dr. *loves to read out of the way*? So let it be then. But this Paragraph is *fruitfull* of Observations of a more important consideration. I shall deliver them as *succinctly* as I can; yet so as to make my self thoroughly understood, and set things in a full Light.

First then I observe that we are but just got over two of your *Proofs* against the Dr. (*sc.* the *Quotations* out of *Harpocration* and *Suidas*) but that he matches them with two *Additions* of his own, (*sc.* the two *Epigrams* out of the *Anthology*) to the one of which the new *Authority* added makes the Dr's *some Additions*, Three; to his supposed *Plagiarisms*, Two. You see, Sir, you have lost ground at the *starting-Post*, and I dare say you'll be distanc'd out and out e'er you reach half the *Course*. I might farther observe that this new *Authority* produced by the Dr. (which if any body had done before him, 'tis more than I know) for part of one of these *Epigrams*, gives it with something of difference in the reading from that of the *Anthology*. 'Tis true, that difference is not in this place very material, the sense in both coming to the same. And yet this cannot be said to be an Insignificancy; since though not here, yet in many other places the same *Fragments* produced

duced out of several Authors, what from the variety of the *Lectiōs*, and other circumstances is rescued from that obscurity in which it must otherwise for ever have remained unintelligible. And this is a case which happens so very often in the Dr's Collection, that there are but few Pages, which afford not instances of it in abundance; proving at the same time the compass of his Reading, and the exactness of his Judgment. Or however if any one should (as none that understands any thing in Affairs of this nature will) censure this multiplying of Authorities to the same purpose for a vain and fruitless Curiosity: yet at least it clears him from the Imputation of *Plagiarism*. For if in some, nay in many places, the Dr. and your MS. fall *Supr. p. 17.* in with the same *Quotations*: that, as hath been before said, the nature of the thing renders impossible to have been otherwise: But if your MS. produces a Fragment attested (as is generally the case) with only one *Authority*, or suppose two, and the Dr. adds one, two, or three more; how is he a Plagiary? if he could out of his own Stores produce four, three, two, nay or but one *Authority* to which your MS. directed him not; why may we not suppose him as able to have produced those other also which are to be seen in your MS? Since the same *Reading of the Ancients* required for the former would have done his work for the latter

And here I cannot but give the Reader notice of a common Fallacy put upon him throughout the whole course of your Book: which is this, That you generally alledge your *Proofs* against the Dr. by the Tale of the *Number* of the *Fragments*: and these *Figures* in many places stand

stand crowded together so thick one upon the other, that they make a formidable appearance. Thus p. 36. under the Title ΑΙΤΙΟΝ Α' (Αἰτίων it should have been, as in Dr. Bentley, Τὸ πρῶτον ἂν Αἰτίων) you run on strangely with your Numbers; as, N. 12, 13, 14, are taken from Mr. Stanley, as is also the 17th; the 18th from Parrhasius, to whom he was directed; 21st from Mr. Stanley; 27, 28, 29, from Mr. Stanley. But what a Shoal of them is there in p. 42, N^o. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60. And what of all these? Why all taken from Mr. Stanley. But this is a most Notorious Illusion; the Quotations produced by your MS. under the several Numbers, or other References to the Dr's Collection making sometimes not the half (a), sometimes not the Quarter (b), nay sometimes not the 10th (c), nay sometimes not the 20th (d) part of those produced by the Dr. in the places so refer'd to. He that thinks I am upon the stretch let him collate the Dr's Collection with Mr. Stanley's MS. upon the places pointed out in the Margin; where under the first of those References he will find the Dr's Additions to be at least three to two, under the second at least five to one, under the third at least ten, and under the fourth twenty to one to what he is supposed to have found ready collected to his hand in Mr. Stanley's MS. And yet so have you printed the Case that the Reader who understands no more of the matter than what he sees of it in your Book, and never

D

gives

(a) As N. 2, 27, 38, 40, 42, 46, 50, &c.

(b) As N. 52, 67. tit. Ἑλεῖν, n. 86, &c.

(c) As tit. Ἐμπεριματά, vid. Dr. B. p. 324. & 228, & Gravii Proem. p. 5. & tit. IBIS Dr. B. p. 345.

(d) Ἐμπεριματά, ut supra, & (notwithstanding our Vindicator's Caveat, p. 54.) tit. Θαυμάσια, Dr. B. from p. 327, to p. 337.

gives himself the trouble of looking into the Dr's Collection, takes it as if *all* that was under those *Numbers* were transcribed from Mr. *Stanley*: and goes away satisfied of your Ingenuity, because you acknowledge the Dr. to have made *some* Additions of his *own*; *sc.* the addition of those simple *Numbers* omitted in your *Tale*; as between *Number* 50 and 60, the Addition of that single *Number* 56. whereas the Addition of the simple *Numbers* doth not upon the whole (and I am sure I speak within compass) make up a quarter part of these *some* Additions which you ingenuously allow the Dr. to have made to Mr. *Stanley's* MS. Nay I am inclined to believe, that upon a just Calculation, all that is in your MS. will scarce be found to bear the proportion of one to twenty to what is in the Dr's Collection: taking in *all*, I mean, that the Dr. hath done upon *Calimachus*, either by way of Addition of fresh *Epigrams*, *Fragments*, or *Testimonia*; or the Addition of fresh *Authorities* to those already produced (as effectual an Addition as any) or by way of *Emendation* and *Explication* of the *Text* in his Notes upon the several parts of that Author: his Translation of almost all the *Fragments*, and many of the *Epigrams* I put not into the accounts, though a work requiring the exercise of some other faculty besides that of *Memory*. All these things, I say, laid together, I am pretty confident the Dr's *some* Additions will be found more than twenty to one to what is in your MS. But there is no need of my running things so high. Suppose we stood upon the *Par*, and the Dr's Additions did but just keep up with your MS. yet even so, why must he have stole his *half* share from Mr. *Stanley*? Since the same *Industry* that sup-
ply'd

ply'd him with the *one half* part, *not* in your MS. would in course have supply'd him with thy *other half* which is *in* your MS. As for instance, in *p. 37* of your Book, the Quotation out of the *Scholiast* upon *Sophocles*, *n. 21.* you charge upon the Dr. as directly stoll out of your MS. in these words, *n. 21. from Mr Stanley.* But *another* Quotation out of the same *Scholiast*, and standing in the *same* page of the Dr's *P. 310.* Collection, *n. 26.* you leave him in full possession of: nay, and yet *another* Quotation out of the same *Scholiast*, *n. 209.* you allow him to have *transcribed* from that *Scholiast* himself, adding in express terms, *whom the Dr. had consulted.* *P. 71.* But what reason can you give for the difference here? why *n. 26.* and *n. 209.* should have been (as you elegantly express it,) *the genuine Off- P. 30.* spring of the Doctor's own Brain; but *n. 21.* directly taken, as you positively aver, from Mr. Stanley? So again, in *p. 42.* I find you bringing in the Dr. Debtor to Mr. Stanley for a Quotation out of the *Scholiast* upon *Apollonius Rhodius*, *n. 49.* but *another* Quotation out of the same *Scholiast*, Dr. B. *p. 355.* you frankly allow to be his *Own.* But why the one rather than the other? your words in that place are so very express and significative, that I think them worth the transcribing, *p. 68.* under the Title *Ἰσοειγία P. 68.* *Ἰσοειγία.* The passages out of *Athenæus* and *Harpocration* are *transcribed* from Mr. Stanley; the other two out of the *Scholiast* upon *Apollonius* and *Eustathius* are the *Product* of Dr. Bentley's own *Observation* in reading the *Ancients.* And with this you conclude (as to the *Fragments*) your *Detail of Particulars:* and more unluckily you could not have done it. Thus

P. 21.

much I must needs say for you, that you are no Artist at managing an Accusation, nor much practised in this way of writing; which I assure you I am far from objecting against you as a Disparagement. I wonder that some or other of the Party did not spy this flaw, and put some better Disguise upon the matter for you. But 'tis plain, from the many mistakes in the *first* Edition of your Book not corrected, or coloured over in the *second*, that they took no manner of care of you. 'Twas ungratefully done of them thus to neglect a person who had discovered so forwardly a Zeal for the cause; and ventured his *all* to serve them. But 'tis strange, that you *your self* should not have perceived it, that these last words overthrow all that you had been doing before. For I cannot conceive any Reader so very *Thoughtless*, as not to catch you up here of his own accord: If the *Passages* out of the Scholiast upon Apollonius and Eustathius were the *Product* of the Dr's own Observation in reading the Ancients; why then, why might not the *two Passages* out of *Athenæus* and *Harpocration* be so too? Or by what strange fate were the Dr's fingers directed, that should thus have led them directly to the very Book, Page, and Line, where lay any of those Fragments of *Callimachus*, which Mr. Stanley had not meddled with; but bound them up from so much as once touching upon any one of those which Mr. Stanley had before impropriated? This is so obvious a Reflection, that upon second thought you cannot but blame your own Indiscretion in laying it so full in view. The untoward way of your concluding *your Detail of Particulars* puts me in mind of the words with which you

con

conclude your whole Book, *If this will not convince and amend him, I resign him to better management.* And really, Sir, that you must do. If it be resolved that Dr. Bentley shall be confounded, it must be done by some hand more accustomed to these sorts of Exercises.

This Article of the Dr's *some* Additions I look'd upon to be a most material point, and such wherein the very substance of the cause is very nearly concern'd; and therefore gladly laid hold on the first opportunity of considering it somewhat particularly.

At the beginning of this *Remark*, I made mention of a *bold stroke of the Pen*, and what that is we shall see in the observation I am now going upon. It naturally arises from this same Paragraph, and is one of the choicest of the whole Set: and therefore I cannot but usher it in with a special Recommendation.

I observe therefore, that the other Book, besides the *Anthology*, out of which the Dr. fetches part of one of these *Epigrams*, is that *known* Lexicographer, *Suidas*; nay, but *Suidas* in the *Letter οὐνεῖν*? If you remember a certain passage in your Book, the very mention of these words cannot but a little startle you: perhaps you have forgot it: turning therefore to your 82d page, you will find your self thus directing your Speech to your Honourable Patron.

These two Quotations (your meaning plainly is, the *Omission of these two Quotations*) from so *known* a Lexicographer incline me to believe, that the *Remark* is very true, p. 245. (m.244.) of your *Learned Examination of his Dissertation*, that he is got no further than the *Letter Κάπνα* in *Suidas*.

Those two Quotations you speak of are out of *Suidas*, lit. Κ. υυ. Κωλιάς, Κωμῆται, which being in Mr. Stanley's MS. but not in Dr. Bentley's Collection; from thence you infer, that the Dr. hath not read *Suidas* beyond the Letter Κάππα: now from thence should I have inferr'd, That the Dr. did not transcribe Mr. Stanley's MS. for had he transcribed Mr. Stanley's MS. he could not have miss'd of those two Quotations. How these two passages out of *Suidas* came to be wanting in the Dr's Collection I know not. 'Tis most likely it was purely by oversight in his digesting and transcribing his Collections for the Press, which he tells us was done in *great haste*. And I am the rather inclin'd so to believe, because in the Dr's Collection I find the Title ΓΛΑΥΚΟΣ (as you well observe) wanting in its proper place: which can have been only an oversight; that Title, with several others being preserved by *Suidas*, υ. Καλλιμάχος: and accordingly, though wanting in the Body of the Collection, yet we find it standing among the rest in the Catalogue which the Dr. hath given us of all the Works of that Poet.

*Summa
festinatio-
ne, not. in
Epig. 49.
P. 40.*

P. 304.

As you refer us to the very page where that Remark is to be found, and indeed that Honourable Gentleman himself seeming desirous that his *Penetration* upon a like occasion should be taken notice of; I presume I shall oblige you Both by transcribing it. Not every one that reads these Papers may have that Book by him: and besides, I were ambitious of having in this *silly* Piece of mine some few Lines at least, that will be Unexceptionably Good.

And

*And this (to his Eternal Scandal be it spoken) Mr. B. p. is a Plain Proof that he hath not read over all Sui-²⁴⁴das. Nay, I have reason to suspect, that he is got no further than Κάππα, which I observe * here to be the utmost Line of his Citations. I would not have the Reader slight this Discovery of mine, for 'tis as considerable as any of Dr. Bentley's, that are purely his own.*

* I see that little word here, and guess at the meaning of it; but how that alters the case, I see not.

No, Sir, I do not slight it, nor did I at the first reading of it. And though there be so many Peculiarities in that ingenious Gentleman's way of writing, that no man who hath read through (so as to know what he is doing) but one half quarter part of his Book can be much surpriz'd at any thing that follows: yet when I came to this particular passage, both the matter of it, and that *Air of satisfaction* with which it is delivered, struck me with fresh Admiration. How! thought I; the Dr. so very familiar with the *Lexicographers*, so conversant with *Suidas in particular*; and yet not got beyond the Letter Κάππα in *Suidas*? 'Tis strange. I cannot suppose that Honourable Gentleman, when he wrote his *Examination of Dr. Bentley*, not to have thoroughly read that Piece of the Dr's which he so often quotes, *sc. his Letter to Dr. Mill*, printed at the end of *Malela's Chronology*: where he could not but have seen the Dr. p. 32. upon the Letter λ. in *Suidas*, v. Δυ-^{P.147,158, 166, 170, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, &c.} δίδζων, and p. 62, 68. upon the Letter ο. υυ. Όμνες, Όρεφους: upon the Letter π. v. Πείσκος, p. 85. and p. 12. upon the Letter α. v. Σοφοκλῆς. After all which I cannot see what reason he had to suspect that the Dr. was got no further than the Letter Κάππα in *Suidas*.

Mr. B. p.

140, 285.

Vind. p. 26.

But there is a certain *Proverbial Gnomē* in our Language, which by the help of an *Extensive Charity* will cover a Multitude of that Ingenious Gentleman's σφάλματα μνημονικά, viz. *Good Wits have short Memories*. How you should have been so forgetfull, is a thing not so easie to be accounted for. With what Grace could you say, That you are inclined to believe, that the Dr. is not got beyond the Letter Κάππα in Suidas, when in the very first page of his Collection, you find him in the Letter ~~Θυμ~~ *θυμ*έν? 'Twould be unmannerly in me to say, to your Eternal Scandal be it spoken: but if your Complexion will bear a Blush, you cannot read these Lines without changing Countenance. You tell us, that the Dr. ought not to be angry at it, if he be treated as he deserves, and that you have done it in a plain unaffected Stile, calling a Spade by its right Name. Should I, upon this and the several other occasions, which almost every Page of your Book presents me with, treat you as you deserve, and call things by their Right Names; I know what I should be called my self: unmannerly would be too soft a word for me, and perhaps the Pen too gentle a Weapon for my Chastisement. But I am for sleeping in a whole skin, and therefore shall only in the plain unaffected Stile tell you; That what you say you are inclined to believe, you are not, you can not be inclined to believe: at least you cannot be inclin'd so to believe upon the Reason here given. For if the Dr's having omitted those two Quotations out of Suidas, *v. Κωλιάς, Κωμῆται*, inclined you to believe, that he was not got beyond the Letter Κάππα in Suidas: then his having quoted Suidas in *v. ἑνίας*, should have as strongly

ly inclined you to believe, that he was got as far as the Letter $\delta\mu\kappa\epsilon\sigma\nu$ in Suidas. Give me leave here to trifle with you a little, Sir, and answer you in your own way: For why may not I now and then make a flourish with my Numbers as well as you? Turning to Num. 245. in the Dr's Collection you will find him upon the Letter λ . in Suidas. In Num. 46, 144, 350. and p. 431. Upon the Letter μ . Upon the Letter ν . Num. 345. and p. 431. In Num. 2. and 92. upon the Letter \omicron . In Num. 48, 84, 227. and 344. upon the Letter π . In Num. 49, 59, 71, 299. upon the Letter σ . In Num. 210. upon the Letter τ . In Num. 42. upon the Letter υ . In Num. 50. and p. 349. upon the Letter ϕ . In Num. 193. upon the Letter χ . In Num. 184. upon the Letter ψ . And lastly, in pag. 352. upon the Letter $\omega\mu\epsilon\alpha$.

And now, Sir, what think you of the matter? Are you still inclined to believe, that the Remark is true, That the Dr. is got no further than the Letter $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\alpha$ in Suidas? Is not this what I called in the beginning, making your Court *Sup. p. 3.* to a Young Gentleman at the Expence of your own Modesty? Nay, and is not that Honourable Young Gentleman himself most deeply oblig'd to you for your bringing the scapes of his Pen also under a review?

I wonder what the Reader thinks of me. Certainly 'tis that I am an Idle Man. What a parcel of Figures have I been at the pains of drawing together here? And to what end or purpose? What's any body the better for reading such stuff as this? Upon my word I am perfectly ashamed of my self. But who can help it? If men will put such things as these into
Print,

Print, in *Print* they must be told of them again. For there is no reason in the world for it, That Impertinence should be a Protection to Impudence: or that Men of worth should be made the Mock of Fools, because they that make them so write things so wretchedly trifling, that a man of any Regard to his own Reputation, would be ashamed of the Scandal of having so mis-employed his time as to answer them.

To come off handsomely with your *Κάππα* Observation, you have no other way left you, than to plead that the Dr. stole all his Quotations out of *Suidas*, beyond that *Letter* from Mr. *Stanley's* MS. In answer to which, I need give my self no farther trouble than to turn you back to *Except. 1.* to the *special mark* standing at the top of *p. 9th*, to the Dr's familiarity with this *Lexicographer* before ever he saw your MS. *Except. 4.* and to several other things before said. But the case of *SUIDAS* is somewhat particular, and therefore I cannot think it foreign to our purpose to bestow upon it a special consideration.

This Undertaking therefore of collecting the *Fragments* of *Callimachus* I have reason to suspect was not with that Learned Gentleman, *Mr. Stanley*, as it was with Dr. *Bentley*, a Design long before premeditated, and therefore of a long time carry'd on throughout the whole course of his reading; but a late and sudden Thought taken up upon some special occasion, as probably upon a prospect of publishing a new Edition of the Works of that Poet; which had he finished, it would in all probability have superseded the Labours of those Learned Persons that came after him, and Mr. *Stanley's* *Callimachus*.

Dacier.
Gravina.

limachus might have stood to this day (as *his* *Æschylus* still doth, and is like long so to do) the last Edition of that *Poet*.

His first Essays toward this work appear in those Papers with which you make such a stir, which were once (without his seeking) put into the Dr's hand, and which are now put into other hands to be shewn as Evidence against the Dr. at the sign of the *Half Moon* in *S. Paul's* Church-yard. That they are an *imperfect* *Sup. p. 14.* draught of a more compleat Work you your self acknowledge. But the method in which he proceeded in drawing up this *imperfect* Draught, is perhaps more than what you may have yet observed. I must confess I could willingly have seen the *Original* it self, but as I think I can do my work without it, I were not over eager of satisfying an unnecessary Curiosity at the hazard of venturing into a place where 'tis so dangerous a thing to express one's self too familiarly. I think I have even without the sight of your MS. made a *Discovery*, which if I can make out; let me tell you, Sir, I shall not a little value my self upon it, but judge it altogether as *considerable* as that upon which your Learned Friend so much applauds his own Sagacity: and as it is *purely my own*, I hope the Reader will not *sight* it.

Mr. Stanley therefore having once entred upon this design of Collecting the *Fragments* of *Callimachus*, he doth, as upon the like occasion another man would have done; that is, he fetches in his *first* Materials from such places where they were the most readily found: he turns over the *Indices Authorum* at the end of several * Books, and from thence *hastily* transcribes into his Papers the several passages pointed out to

* As Clem. Alexandrinus, Stobæus, Strabo, Athenæus, Etymolog. Magn. Stephan. Byzant. &c.

P. 60.

to him, *v. Callimachus*, reserving (as you yourself in part acknowledge) a more diligent perusal of the Authors themselves, and a more accurate Examination of the passages taken out of them to his second Thoughts. There was not any one Author more proper to his purpose than *Suidas*. But *Suidas* having no *Index Authorum* annexed to him, with him Mr. Stanley begins, and turns over all that *Lexicographer* himself from the beginning to the end: as for the rest contenting himself, for a time, with what the *Indexes* supply'd him with. This I confess is mere *Conjecture*: but a *Conjecture* so manifestly founded upon *matter of fact*, that I dare boldly pronounce it next to a Certainty: and whether I am too confident, I shall submit to the Judgment of the Reader upon an instance or two by and by to be produced. Now Mr. Stanley having taken this course with *Suidas* in particular, it is impossible but that the far greatest part of the Quotations out of *Suidas* in the Dr's Collection should have been anticipated by Mr. Stanley. And had that Learned Gentleman in these Papers of his taken the same course with many other Authors, you would have had, though not more of *Truth*, yet a better *Colour* for your Accusation. But if you will still resolutely maintain it, that the Dr. having seen your MS. therefore all the Quotations out of *Suidas* in the Dr's Collection shall have been transcribed from Mr. Stanley, I know not how to clear my self of you, but by the help of a *Distinction*. And this *Distinction* of mine, Sir, I desire you well to consider, and withal to remember, that it will perform the same upon any other Author, as upon *Suidas*: and therefore

fore though *Suidas* be the name we are here upon, yet the Argument extends to the whole body of the cause : which will excuse me in insisting the more particularly upon it.

Of the Quotations out of *Suidas* therefore I observe some of them to stand in that *Lexicon* with the name of *Callimachus* affixed to them in words at length : others of them to contain some *Fragments* of that *Poet*, or to refer to some passages in him, but without express mention of his Name. Those of this later sort (as they are not numerous) I will be at the pains of marking out to you; viz. one Quotation, *Num.* 2. one of the Quotations (*sc.* that *v. ὑδατῶδες*) *Num.* 42. another *Num.* 48. Two Quotations, *Num.* 50. and another 88. Now, Sir, there are in the Dr's Collection (as far as you have carried on the comparison, that is from *Num.* 1. to *Num.* 103.) in all about thirty Quotations out of *Suidas*, to every one of which, saving those in the Numbers here mention'd, you will find added the Name of *Callimachus* standing in words at length : and every one of those *Fragments*, to which the Name of their Author is so added, I find you charging upon the Dr. as stoln from Mr. *Stanley*; that single one *v. ὅλην*, Dr. B. p. 352. excepted, though even that also (however by you omitted) I am apt to believe upon further search would be found in your MS. But of these latter sort, which have not the Name of *Callimachus* so added to them, I do not find you mentioning any single one of them as taken from Mr. *Stanley*, and therefore have some Reason to suspect that Learned Gentleman to have overlook'd them. Upon this point I have endeavoured to express my self as plainly
as

as I could, and I desire the Reader to look over these Lines again, till he fully takes my meaning.

Now, Sir, if this Observation of mine should hold as to all or but the major part of those Quotations, it would do me considerable service, and that upon more accounts than one.

1. It absolutely confounds your *Κάππα* observation, since in several of even *these* Quotations from *Suidas*, not (as I presume) to be found in your MS. we find the Dr. advanced far beyond *Κάππα*, as in the Letter *ο*. Num. 2. *π*. Num. 48. *υ*. Num. 42. *φ*. Num. 50. with others I could name. But of this I think you have had enough already.

2. It effectually clears the Dr. from having stoln from your MS. those Quotations which are in your MS. For if he could of his own Sagacity fetch out of *Suidas* such Fragments of *Callimachus* as had not the name of their Author joyn'd with them, he cannot be supposed to have overlook'd those where the very word *Καλλιμαχος* staring him in the face, could not ^{Supr. p. 11.} but have put him in mind of his *Common-place Book*.

3. We have here yet another instance of what I have so very often observ'd in the Writings against Dr. Bentley; That there is scarce any one single Article any where advanced against him by way of Accusation or Reproach; which, when thoroughly sifted, doth not turn to his Acquittment and greater *Approbation*. As in the present case, what a plain proof is here of his extraordinary Readiness at these sorts of ^{Supr. p. 12.} Studies, and with how just an assurance he might make that *Boast* (for so, to be sure, you'll call it)

it) beforementioned that *he thought he could not, easily be deceived, in knowing whether a Greek Verse were ascribed to its proper Author*; since in so many instances here given, meeting with a poor stragling Fragment of this Ancient Greek Poet, though in a lost, and as it were *orphani- zed* condition; yet he presently knew (so well was he acquainted with the whole Race of them) to whom it belonged, and returned it to its right Parent. Thus while you prefer against the Dr. an Accusation of *Plagiarism*, you do but the more fully prove to any one that will be at the pains of examining into the matter, how rich he is in his own Stores, and how little a loser by being placed in any comparison.

Cease therefore, let me beseech you, this your *Critical War*, or rather go on still writing till you shall have made him, as generally *observed* and *admired* at home as he is abroad.

So *Diamonds take a lustre from their Foyle,*
And B——y owes his Honours to B——e. *Dispensary.*

4. But fourthly, and that which I principally intended in making this *Observation*, it hath given me the hint of putting the Reader, who is minded to be satisfied in this Affair into the method of doing it for himself more effectually than I could have done it for him. But in order to that, I must put my *Distinction* upon a little farther *Trial*. How the case stands between the Quotations from *Suidas* of the *former* and of the *later* sort; and between the Dr's Collection and Mr. *Stanley's* upon that *Distinction* from *Num. 1. to Num. 103.* hath been already
con-

consider'd. From *Num.* 103. to the end of the Dr's Collection there may be *thirty* or *forty* more Quotations out of *Suidas*; of which all the rest are of the *former* sort, *sc.* standing there with the name of their Author added to them: ~~but~~ these few following are of the *later* sort, *sc.* referring to passages in *Callimachus*, but without any mention of his Name. The Quotations under *Num.* 103, 128, 193, 227. (*υυ. Κιλλικων, Εχιδνιον*) 233, and 304. (*υ. Αρπιδδσι.*) Now to shew the Use and Application of this *Distinction*.

In that pithy Peroration which, *p.* 68. you make upon the *main body* of your *Proofs* against the Dr. you have these words. *Thus have I pass'd through many of those Fragments that are capable of being placed in their several Classes.* — And for the rest the Reader may, as his Inclinations lead him, collate the MS. Copies (in which great variety offers it self out of *Athenæus*, the Lexicographers, and Scholiasts) with Dr. Bentley's printed Collection.

With all my heart: most gladly do I joyn with you in your Appeal to the MS. it self, and I hope these Papers may fall into the hands of some Readers, whose *Inclinations* may lead them to make the Experiment you propose. I would desire no fairer play in this cause than to have the Jury bring in their Verdict upon View.

Let the Reader therefore take these Papers along with him, go to the *Bookseller's* Shop at the Sign of the *Half Moon* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, call for the *Manuscript* to be shewn there against Dr. Bentley, and leisurely collate Mr. Stanley's Collection of the Fragments of *Callimachus* with the Dr's. And though I have ne-

ver seen that MS. nor know any thing more of it directly or indirectly than what, Sir, I have learned from your Book: yet I fancies I can pretty nearly tell the Reader what he *will* find there, and what he *will not* find there. A profound Mr. B. p. Scholar *this!* (will you say of me now) as 98, 232. well read in what he has not seen as in what he has. But such things may be done, Sir. You have led me part of my way: and you know the Proverb, *ex ungue leonem*. How far I go upon sure grounds, *sc.* upon the Authority of your Book, shall be mark'd out by this stroak (†): and though for what follows, (saying for here and there a *Number*) I shall be purely upon the *Conjecture*; yet I hope the Reader will not find me very often mistaken in my Guess.

Of the *Quotations* out of *Suidas* in Dr. Bentley's Collection of the Fragments of *Callimachus* these following *Numbers*.

In Mr. Stanley.

Num. 1, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 49, 50, 53, 59, 66, 68, 71, 82, 84, 92 †; and 110, 144, 182, 184, 210, 227, 232, 238, 249, 279, 288, 289, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 338, 339, 340, 344, 345, 350. with five or six more *Quotations* out of *Suidas*, Dr. B. p. 430, 431.

Note, Some of the Fragments under these *Numbers* being produced from both the *Etymologicon* and *Suidas*, perhaps Mr. Stanley may have contented himself with one of those *Authorities* for them, and so have omitted the Reference to *Suidas*: and others of them containing only single and independent words, perhaps he may not have thought them worth the transcribing. But this is mere guess.

E

Not

Not in Mr. Stanley.

The Quotations under. Num. 2, 42, 48, 50, 88, 103, 110, (vv. Ἀρεσκία, Δανάη) 128, 227, 233, 245, 304. *supr.* p. 45, 48.

And now, Sir, could you your self, had you pursu'd your *Topick* to the end of the Chapter, have made more of your MS. against the Dr. than I have made of it for you? having scarce left him throughout his whole Collection one single *Number* not voluntarily surrendred up to Mr. Stanley: which yet is so far from *Convicting* him of *Plagiarism*, that the more it *appears* against him, the more it *proves* for him. For Mr. Stanley having (as 'tis plain he had) read over all *Suidas*, and read him with a *Design* of Collecting the Fragments of *Callimachus*; few of those *Fragment*s which stood there marked out to him with the *Name* of their Author written upon them can be supposed to have escaped his Observation: but if many or the greatest part of those of the *later sort* not so marked out to him; which are to be seen in the Dr's Collection shall not appear in Mr. Stanley's; my Inference is already made: therefore those *Fragment*s which are in Mr. Stanley the Dr. did not transcribe from Mr. Stanley. For since for the Quotations of this *latter sort* he must have read *Suidas* himself, he cannot have wanted the help of your MS. for those of the *former*. So that the Conclusion from the whole is this; That Mr. Stanley had read *Suidas* thoroughly, but Dr. Bentley had read him more thoroughly.

'Tis time now that I let you see what I have been doing all this while in making such a stir with the *Quotations* out of *Suidas*.

Great

Great variety, say you, of the same passages which are printed in Dr. Bentley's Collection will the Reader (whose inclinations shall lead him to make the Tryal) find in Mr. Stanley's MS. P. 68.

Yes, Sir, *great variety* of that kind undoubtedly he will find. But have you many Authors that will present him with *greater variety* than *Suidas*?

Out of Athenæus.

Yes; for *Athenæus* hath an *Index Authorum* made to him.

Out of the Lexicographers.

And most of those *Lexicographers* too have such *Indexes* printed with them; and some of the *Lexicographers* (of one 'tis certain) Mr. Stanley may have turned all over.

And out of the Scholiasts.

For some of the *Scholiasts* also have the like *Indexes*; and with other of the *Scholiasts* Mr. Stanley may have taken the same course that he hath with *Suidas*.

Here therefore to the Reader, who shall have the curiosity to make the experiment you propose, and who shall be endued with the patience to go through with it, I shall offer some few *Cautions*, by the help of which he may be secured from passing a mistaken judgment.

1. In the first place therefore, he is not to judge of the Dr's Collection by the *great variety* of its *Coincidences* with Mr. Stanley's as to those Fragments of *Callimachus* which are taken from such Books as have their *Indices Authorum* printed with them. These indeed, were they all muster'd up together, with our *Vindicator's* — in Mr. Stanley, bringing them up in the Rear would make a terrible *shew* against the Dr.

Not in Mr. Stanley.

The Quotations under. Num. 2, 42, 48, 50, 88, 103, 110, (vv. Ἀχρησία, Δανάη) 128, 327, 333, 245, 304. *supr.* p. 45, 48.

And now, Sir, could you your self, had you pursu'd your *Topick* to the end of the Chapter, have made more of your MS. against the Dr. than I have made of it for you? having scarce left him throughout his whole Collection one single *Number* not voluntarily surrendred up to Mr. Stanley: which yet is so far from *Convicting* him of *Plagiarism*, that the more it *appears* against him, the more it *proves* for him. For Mr. Stanley having (as 'tis plain he had) read over all *Suidas*, and read him with a *Design* of Collecting the Fragments of *Callimachus*; few of those *Fragment*s which stood there marked out to him with the *Name* of their Author written upon them can be supposed to have escaped his Observation: but if many or the greatest part of those of the *later sort* not so marked out to him; which are to be seen in the Dr's Collection shall not appear in Mr. Stanley's; my Inference is already made: therefore those *Fragment*s which are in Mr. Stanley the Dr. did not transcribe from Mr. Stanley. For since for the Quotations of this *latter sort* he must have read *Suidas* himself, he cannot have wanted the help of your MS. for those of the *former*. So that the Conclusion from the whole is this; That Mr. Stanley had read *Suidas* thoroughly, but Dr. Bentley had read him more thoroughly.

'Tis time now that I let you see what I have been doing all this while in making such a stir with the *Quotations out of Suidas*.

Great

Great variety, say you, of the same passages P. 68.
which are printed in Dr. Bentley's Collection will the Reader (whose inclinations shall lead him to make the Tryal) find in Mr. Stanley's MS.

Yes, Sir, *great variety* of that kind undoubtedly he will find. But have you many Authors that will present him with *greater variety* than *Suidas*?

Out of Athenæus.

Yes; for *Athenæus* hath an *Index Authorum* made to him.

Out of the Lexicographers.

And most of those *Lexicographers* too have such *Indexes* printed with them; and some of the *Lexicographers* (of one 'tis certain) Mr. *Stanley* may have turned all over.

And out of the Scholiasts.

For some of the *Scholiasts* also have the like *Indexes*; and with other of the *Scholiasts* Mr. *Stanley* may have taken the same course that he hath with *Suidas*.

Here therefore to the Reader, who shall have the curiosity to make the experiment you propose, and who shall be endued with the patience to go through with it, I shall offer some few *Cautions*, by the help of which he may be secured from passing a mistaken judgment.

1. In the first place therefore, he is not to judge of the Dr's Collection by the *great variety* of its *Coincidences* with Mr. *Stanley's* as to those Fragments of *Callimachus* which are taken from such Books as have their *Indices Authorum* printed with them. These indeed, were they all muster'd up together, with our *Vindicator's* — in Mr. *Stanley*, bringing them up in the Rear would make a terrible *shew* against the Dr.

Harpocraton, The Quotations in Dr. Bentley, n. 1. p. 352, 353, 354. † and n. 319. — in Mr. Stanley.

Clemens Alexandrinus, The Quotations. n. 2, 3, 87. p. 337. † and n. 133, 145, 187, 188. — in Mr. Stanley.

Strabo, The Quotations, p. 337, 354. † and n. 104, 112, 113. p. 430, 431. — in Mr. Stanley.

Hesychius, n. 58. † and 229, 230, 231, 232, 352, 353, 354, 355, 357. — in Mr. Stanley.

Pindari Scholiastes, n. 77, 80. p. 352. † and n. 108, 112, 119, 120, 121, 122, 136, 138, 188, 195, 196, 197, 198. — in Mr. Stanley.

Etymologicon, n. 12, 17, 19, 28, 36, 40, 44, 53, 66, 67, 86, 96. p. 349, 351, 467, 469. † and n. 129, 130, 131, 132, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, — 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, &c. in Mr. Stanley.

All or at least the greatest part of these Numbers in the Dr's Collection, with their leading Fragments, I little doubt, but that the Collator will find in Mr. Stanley's MS. with far greater variety of the same kind out of *Athenaus*, the *Lexicographers*, some of the *Scholiasts*, *Servius* upon *Virgil*, *Stobaeus*, *Priscian*, *Hephestion*, and some others. But then he must consider, that all these Authors have *Indices* to them, in which (*v. Callimachus*) all these Fragments were ready pointed out to him. So that Mr. Stanley, in drawing up this imperfect draught, having

having taken (as most certainly he did) that method of fetching in his first Materials from the *Indexes* of Books, where those *Indexes* were tolerably perfect: the Dr's *Coincidencies* with Mr. Stanley must be proportionably frequent; and, as to those particular Authors, far outnumber his *Additions* to it.

Here therefore the Collator is to apply the *Distinction* before made upon the Quotations out of *Suidas*, and the Inference from thence drawn: and to consider whether or no those *some Additions* of the Dr's *own* are not such which necessarily imply his having read, and that thorowly too, the Authors themselves, out of whom he produces his Quotations, and consequently such as place him far above, wanting the help either of the *Index* or of your MS. As for instance; The *Fragment*, n. 50. is in Mr. Stanley; but in Mr. Stanley (I conjecture) from *Athenaus*, whose *Index* supply'd him with it. Is it in Mr. Stanley from *Suidas*, *v. κερύκειμον, φθινόπωρον* (or at least from the later of them) in both which it stands without the name of its Author? The *Fragment*, n. 48 may be in Mr. Stanley. But in Mr. Stanley from the *Scholiast* on *Pindar*, an *Index'd* Book. Is that manifest reference to this *Fragment*, *Suidas*, *v. παναρκής* in Mr. Stanley? So that *Fragment*, n. 227. from *Suidas*, I doubt not but that the Collator will find in Mr. Stanley, but from *Suidas*, *v. πονηρός* will he find it also from *Suidas*, *v. κιλλικών*, where it stands without the name of its Author? The *Fragment*, n. 245 he will find in Mr. Stanley, but from the *Etymologicon*, whose *Index* directed him to it: will he find the Authority of *Suidas* for the same *Fragment*, who hath it,

but without the name of its Author. The Fragment, *n.* 169. he will find in Mr. *Stanley* from the *Etymologicon*; but will he also find the Emendation and Explication of that Fragment from the *Scholiast* on *Theocritus*, and from another place in the *Etymologicon*. If not, therefore that other place in the *Etymologicon* the Dr. read himself. But this is a thing so very certain, that no man who hath but once dip'd into any chance place of the Dr's *Epist. ad fin. Malel.* who hath but just glanc'd over some few pages of his late Answer to Mr. *Boyle* (though as hastily and heedlessly as the man that read it all over in a day) who will but cast his Eye upon this his Collection of the Fragments of *Callimachus*, can entertain the least scruple concerning it. However, since I have to do with men who will not be content with a moderate Conviction, I shall desire the Reader, who will be at the pains of making the experiment, to collate, and that somewhat nicely, the Dr. with Mr. *Stanley* upon these following *Numbers*.

Num. 13, 14, 18, 29, 32, 51, 54, 55, 57, 75, (*v. Κεγόων*) †, and *n.* 4, 15, 16, 23, 30, 31, 33, 56, 73, 75, (*v. Θύβη*) 126, 168, 186, 207, 218, 234, 238, 259, 260, 306, 314, 334, 351, 362, 367, 368, 369, 370, 417.

Upon this List of *Numbers* the Reader is desir'd to observe, that all the *Numbers* standing before †, together with the Quotation produced by Dr. *Bentley* in his Notes on the *Epigrams of Callimachus Ep.* 39. *p.* 210. are in Mr.

P. 36. N. 18. *Stanley*; excepting *Num.* 18. (*v. Τερανεία*) from *Par-* which Fragment I have as great an assurance as
rhasius. n. b. 'tis possible for a man to have in a matter of this
not from nature, and which our *Vindicator* himself with
Stephanus.

Mr. *Bent-*
ley's Ap-
pendix, p.
134.

a *simplicity* truly *simple* acknowledges, Mr. Stanley transcribed from that forementioned passage in *Parrhasius*, marked out to him in *Gruter's* Index. But of the *Numbers* following † there's not one of them so marked out in the *Index* to *Stephanus*. Here therefore *Query*, How many of *these* Numbers after † are there in Mr. Stanley? Upon this the Collator is to make the Scrutiny. And if the Experiment answers my expectation my inferences are plain. 1. That Mr. Stanley did indeed take this method of fetching in his Fragments from the *Indexes* of Books. 2. Dr. Bentley read over the Books themselves, and was above both the *Index* and Mr. Stanley's MS. Here are in all, Quotations out of *Stephanus Byzant.* forty; of which *Eleven* index'd, *sc. ten* in the *Index* to *Stephanus*; and the other in *Gruter's* Index: all these — in Mr. Stanley. — Not index'd *twenty nine*, — in Dr. Bentley. — Not, I suppose, in Mr. Stanley.

And if this Conjecture of mine should hold, I think 'tis pretty much to the purpose. But where the *Indexes* are compleatly drawn, the like experiment cannot be made. In such cases a great part of the Dr's Quotations must of necessity have been anticipated by Mr. Stanley. Nor need I, I think, say more to shew the reasonableness of this Caution, not to judge of the Dr. by the *great variety* of his *Coincidencies* with Mr. Stanley, as to his Quotations out of such Authors, where the Fragments of *Callimachus* are marked out in the *Indexes*. Nor,

2. Secondly, is he to judge of the Dr. by the *great variety* of his *Coincidencies* with Mr. Stanley, as to his Quotations from some few particular,

ticular Authors, who may have no such *Indexes* made to them. For with some particular Authors Mr. Stanley may have taken the same course as he hath with *Suidas*, and if so, the same effects of it will appear in his MS. As for example, I find the *Scholiast* upon *Nicaner* once produced by Dr. Bentley, n. 60. and that the same Fragment is in Mr. Stanley. Nor within the line of comparison do I find any thing more of that *Scholiast*. But from after n. 103. I find the Dr. producing out of him several Fragments, as n. 139, 140, 201, 228, 253, 267, 268, &c. Now if Mr. Stanley had after his having began his Collection read over this *Scholiast*, those Numbers of the Dr's must also be in Mr. Stanley. The like may be conjectured of the Fragments from *Ammonius*, *μεγίστου*, &c. But the *Vindicator* hath not carried on his comparison far enough for me to go here upon any certainty. Now such *Coincidencies*, though never so constant, prove no more against the Dr. than that Mr. Stanley and he had read the same Books, *vid. supr. p. 17.* And here, since I have been at the foolish labour of drawing them up, I shall present the Collator with a list of Authors.

Apollonius Alexand. Artemidorus, Athenagoras, Censorino adjectus scriptor, Johannes Charax, Cheroboscus, Cicero, Diogenes Laertius, Dionysius Halicarnass. Sextus Empiricus, Erotianus, Eusebius, Fulgentius, Flanciades, Galenus, A. Gellius. Helladii Chrestom. Herodiani Paræchol. Hyginus, Julianus, Lucianus, Macrobius. MSS. & Codd. inediti, ut Photii Lexicon, ineditum, &c. Phlegon Trallianus, Plinius, Plutarchus, Proclus in Platonis Timæum, in Parmenid.

*menid. inedit. in Hesiodum, Cbrestomathia. Quin-
tilian, Solinus, Statius Poeta. Terentianus
Maurus, Theodoretus, Tertullianus, Tzetzes
(uterque) Varro. Scholiastæ in Homerum, Didy. Supr. p. 26.
mus, Eustathius, Porphyrius; in Æschylum, A-
ratum, Aristophanem, Euripidem, Ibin Ovidii,
Theocritum.*

Thus have I chosen rather to expose the Dr.
to the repeated Censure of being a *Polymathist*, *Supr. p. 11.*
(that is, a *Great Scholar*, and one that hath
read a great many Books) than to be wanting
in my *Instructions* to the Reader, *whose Inclina-
tions shall lead him to collate the MSS.* Out of
all these Authors will he find in the Dr's Col-
lection somewhat (more or less) either by way
of *Fragment* or *Testimonium*, properly belonging
to *Callimachus*. *Qu.* How many of these *Auth-
ors* will appear in Mr. Stanley's MS. and how
often? Some of them ('tis likely) will be found
there, for some of them (for ought I know) he
may have made use of toward his Collection, and
some particular Passages out of others of them
his course of reading may have casually present-
ed him with. But not many of them, I pre-
sume, will appear there, nor very often. If so:
then I hope the Reader will see the reasonable-
ness of this *Caution*; not to judge of the Dr. by
the (though constant) *Coincidencies* of his Col-
lection with Mr. Stanley's MS. as to some few
particular Authors, though *unindex'd*. For if
the Dr. shall be found to have turned over so
many more Books, than (after his having be-
gan his Collection of the Fragments of *Calli-
machus*) Mr. Stanley had; surely he may be al-
low'd to have read those other *few* of the same
with Mr. Stanley.

N. B.

N. B. I have ventured to insert the name of *Plutarch* into this List. For though the Quotation out of *Plutarch*, n. 86. be in Mr. Stanley; yet I rather suppose it to have been taken immediately from the *Etymologicon*; as n. 103. from *Hadr. Junii Animadvers. lib. 4 c. 21*. marked out in *Gruter's Index* to the fourth Volume of his *Criticks*. Q. is n. 25, 127. there:

The *Scholiast* upon *Æschylus* I have also (though perhaps too boldly) put into this List. The Reader will not, I hope, suppose me so unacquainted with the very Titles of Books, as to make a question of Mr. Stanley's having read (and that most thorowly) the *Scholiast* upon *Æschylus*. But the question is, whether he had turned over that *Scholiast* after his having began this Collection? For I am not here making the comparison between Mr. Stanley and Dr. Bentley, or enquiring which of them had read the most Books; but between Mr. Stanley's imperfect Draught of a Collection of the Fragments of *Callimachus*, and Dr. Bentley's most finished Collection of them that hath ever yet appear'd; and who had read most Books from after their having began their Collections. And let this answer serve once for all to what I should otherwise certainly have heard of, that I am reflecting upon the Memory of Mr. Stanley; which he that shall say of me, will say a falsehood.

These two *Cautions* preceding will justify the Reason of the two following, as that,

3. He is not to discount from the Dr. every Number, the Fragment of which he may find in Mr. Stanley's MS. And so without more ado report it abroad, that he hath been at Mr. Benner's Shop, collated the MS. and finds mat-
ters

ters to stand just as the *Vindicator* hath related them ; that out of the 417 *Numbers* in the Dr's Collection there are so many *Hundreds*, *Tens*, and *Unites* in Mr. *Stanley*. What a numerous appearance of this kind he will be sure to meet with, I have given him so fair notice of beforehand, that I hope he will not be surprized at it. For where a Fragment is preserv'd but in one Author, and in him correct, there the Dr's Collection and Mr. *Stanley's* must fall in with the same Words and Syllables : for let two men transcribe the same Quotation from the same Author, I cannot see why it should be to any one, as it seems to have been to our *Vindicator*, a matter of Admiration, that they should hit upon, not only the *same sense*, but the *same words*. The reason of this *Cauti*on therefore, I hope, the Reader is satisfied in ; that he ought not to discount from the Dr. every *Number*, the whole and only passage under which, without the least Syllable of variation, he will find in Mr. *Stanley*. Much less is he, in the

P. 76.

4. Fourth place, To *abjudge* from the Dr. every *Number*, of which only the leading Fragment is in Mr. *Stanley* ; and so, which is the *Vindicator's* method, for the sake of half a line in Mr. *Stanley's* MS. to cashier, it may be, a whole Page, or two, or more, in the Dr. *vid. sup. p. 33*. But here also he is to remember and apply the distinction before made upon the *Quotations* out of *Suidas*, and to take into the account the many *Additions* of the Dr's own making under every *Number*, and to consider not only the *Quantity* of his *Additions*, but the *Quality* of them also. And particularly, whether

ther or no those *Additions* are not such as would have supported the *Number* it self, though the *Fragment*, supposed to have been taken from Mr. *Stanley*, had not been there. As for instance, the *Fragment*, n. 179. is, 'Αὐτὸς τοῖς μικροῖς μικρὰ διδόναι θεοῖς. This *Fragment* the *Collator* will undoubtedly find in Mr. *Stanley*: for 'tis (with only a little difference in spelling the word μικροῖς) in both the *Etymologicon* and *Stobæus*, and 'index'd in both these Authors. And yet the *Dr.* did not steal it from Mr. *Stanley*; for 'tis in both *Vulcanius* and *Dacier's* printed Collections, *vid. supr. p. 20. Exc. 3.* But in the *Dr's* Collection this same *Fragment* is produc'd from a new *Authority*, sc. *Artemidorus* his *Oneirocriticks*: which new *Authority* is not in any of the other Collections. *Qu.* Is it in Mr. *Stanley*? If not: then this *Fragment* would have been in the *Dr's* Collection, though it had not been either in the *Etymologicon*, or *Stobæus*, or *Vulcanius*, or *Dacier*, or Mr. *Stanley*: Therefore this *Number* must not be cashier'd. Changing the name of *Artemidori Oneirocritica* into *Eusebius Præp. Evang.* The case is exactly the same with the *Fragments* from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, n. 87, 133. Now in such cases, though the *Fragment* it self be in Mr. *Stanley*, yet the new *Authorities* from whence it is produced makes it the *Dr's* own, and secures to him even the *Tale* of his *Numbers*. Instances of this kind I could produce by Scores, where the *Fragment* it self would have been in the *Dr's* Collection, though it had not been in any of the others. If therefore so many *Fragments* would have been in the *Dr's* Collection, though they should have escaped the *Observation* of all that went before him;

him; 'tis not very likely that many of those Fragments collected by them would have escaped the Dr.

And thus much by way of *Caution* to the *Collator* of the MS. the justness and reasonableness of which I submit to the judgment of the Impartial, nay, or even the most partial Reader. Many more of the like nature and tendency may he collect for himself from the whole Tenour of my Discourse foregoing; but I have satisfied my self in particularizing upon these few. Furnished therefore with these *Instructions*, let him go to the *Half Moon*, collate the MS. and speak as he finds. And so *good an opinion have I of my own Performance*, as to hope, that he will find, that I have done even more than my work, and answer'd as well what *I have not seen, as what I have.*

This *Suidas* hath carried me on (such is the *Chain of Thought*) a wide circumference, and made me lanch out into unknown Seas. But our *Vindicator's* Appeal to the MS. was a Temptation I found my self unable to withstand: and whether my Discoveries will prove Land or Clouds will soon be known; unless upon some sudden occasion or other the MS. should chance to be called in.

I made a kind of promise of managing three or four *Decads* of our *Vindicator's Undeniabes* in the same manner I have this first. But the Reader must needs be weary before now of reading such a Parcel of unedifying Lines as these, nor can he think me less weary of writing them. But who can help it? Such is the Book I am answering. And since I am fallen upon so dry a Subject, I were willing to give it

it a thorow Examination, and write a Book for *egregious Dullness*, and elaborate Insignificancy, out-doing (if it be possible) even our *Honest Vindicator* himself. And so, for a Brace of *Controvertists* I defie the Age to match us. I cannot however pass over this *Decad*, without bestowing upon it yet one more Remark.

Remark III.

P. 35. Upon *Proof* 8, 9. (to return at last to our Vindicator himself) you are pleased, Sir, thus to express your self. *His two Quotations* out of *Servius* upon *Virgil*, are transcribed from Mr. Stanley, *verbatim*. Upon which, I cannot but Remark to you, that your Stile is somewhat too *positive* and *emphatick*. Are transcribed from Mr. Stanley : Nay, *verbatim* transcribed from Mr. Stanley ! I remember I have some where or other met with an hard, and indeed (when rightly placed) just Censure past upon such Writers, with whom *positively to aver, and assume the thing in question, is to prove it*. You must give me leave, Sir, upon this occasion, to ask you, I will not say an *insulting* question or two, though I know who has been ask'd a great many such : but that would be an *unmannerly* thing in such an one as I am, to ask you an *insulting* question : a *modest* question or two, I hope I may without offence put to you. Did you see Dr. Bentley transcribe these two Quotations out of *Servius* upon *Virgil* from Mr. Stanley ? Had you a peep-hole into the Dr's Study ? Or did you hang your head over his Shoulder, when he transcribed these two Quotations ? May he not have transcribed them out

of

of *Servius* upon *Virgil* himself? Or are the Drs
 shelves, or is the King's Library unprovided of
 a *Servius* upon *Virgil*? Let me tell you, Sir, to
 be thus *positive* upon Uncertainties, is, even in the
 most trifling and indifferent matters, foolish and
 ridiculous; but in such cases, where my Neigh-
 bour's good name is concerned, highly criminal.
 And yet this, with little variation, is the Stile
 of your whole Indictment: This, and that, and
 tother *Number* or *Quotation*, is transcribed
 from, or taken from, or (with a transcribed,
 or taken *Subintellect*) from Mr. *Stanley*; which
 the Dr makes his own; which the Dr. claims for P. 46, 64.
 his own; which Dr. Bentley, without naming his
Benefactor, has confidently made his own. Yes,
 confidently, Sir. But there I shall meet you a-
 gain by and by. And then will it be seen who
 is the confident man.

I had also designed to have made something
 of Remark upon your *Proof* 4. The Quotati-
 on out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, n. 2. you posi-
 tively aver is in Mr. *Stanley's* Collection. But
 that Quotation out of *Clemens* I verily believe
 is not in Mr. *Stanley*. That Quotation begins
 with these words, 'Ευφροσύνη δὲ ὁ ποιητής, &c.
 Now I desire the Reader to collate the MS. Is
 the word ΙΒΙΣ in Mr. *Stanley*? If not: then
 are you taken positively averring not only an Un-
 certainty, but an Untruth. For if that Quota-
 tion be not there the same, as it is in Dr. Ben-
 tley, 'tis (as to our present Argument) the
 same thing as if it were not there at all. If the
 Dr. both produces it from a new Authority,
 neither in Mr. *Stanley*, nor referr'd to by him;
 and with a *Leſſion* materially different both from
 Mr. *Stanley's* MS. and from all the printed Co-
 pies

pies of *Clemens Alex.*; the consequences from thence are plain: *ergo*. 1. The Dr. did not transcribe it from Mr. Stanley; and *ergo*, you are a false Accuser. 2. The Dr. did not fetch it from the *Index*; since he gives it differently from all the printed Copies to which alone the *Index* could have refer'd him. 3. Though this passage had escaped both Mr. Stanley and all the other Collectors, yet the Dr. would have had it, since he produces it from an *Authority* which none, as far as I can find, ever so much as thought of besides himself. And therefore this Quotation also out of *Clemens Alexandr. n. 2.* must be added to those two others from the same Author, *n. 87, 133. Sup. p 60.* and what is said upon them be repeated upon this; which the Dr. would have had, though he had never had the sight of a printed *Clemens Alex. vid. Dr. Bentley's Collection, p. 345.* Thus have you again alledged against the Dr. as an *Undeniable Proof* of his *Plagiarism* from Mr. Stanley, an instance, which *undeniably* proves the contrary, and verifies what I have before observed upon the Writings against Dr. Bentley; that the more is *alleg'd* against him, the more (to any man that will be at the pains of examining into the matter, and is capable of doing it) is *proved* for him. I have read, Sir, your Page 85. but that is so far from helping you out, that it doth but sink you the deeper in the Mire, and afford still fresh Demonstration against you: as perhaps, if I can find Paper-room for it (for I have almost exceeded my bounds already) I may particularly shew you in a place by it self.

I shall

I shall detain the Reader no longer upon this *Decad* the first, nor trouble him with any more of these tedious Remarks. I may now leave it to himself, to imagin what work might have been made with the *Vindicator's Undeniables*, should I have examin'd every particular as *specially* as I have done these few. And there are abundance more of the same kind. I shall now just cast up the accounts, and see how the case stands between the Dr. and Mr. *Stanley* upon this *Decad* the first, and then dispatch the remainder of my work with all the expedition imaginable.

The Accounts of Decad the First.

Within the compass of *Decad* the First, there are in all, *Quotations* 16. Of which in Mr. *Stanley* 7. For that Quotation just now named from *Clemens Alexandr.* n. 2. and those two from *Didymus* upon *Homer*, n. 5, 6. for the reasons before given, I shall make hold to bring over to the Dr's side. Of these 7. in Mr. *Stanley*, every one, (but that from *Suidas*,) n. 1. *Index'd*: *sc.* 5. of them in the Books from whence they are taken; and the other, *viz.* *Martial's* Epigram in *Parrhasius*, by *Gruter* to his *Fax Artium*, *ut supra*.

In Dr. *Bentley*, *Quotations* 9. not one of them, that I know of, so *index'd*. *Corrections* 5. (his right accenting the word *Ἀξία* I In Mr. *St.* count for one) not in Mr. *Stanley*. So that and *Suid.* though the Dr's *some* Additions rise up but very thin here in comparison of what they do in *Ἀξία*. the following part of his Collection, yet they are even *here* two to one for what is in Mr.

Stanley; to which the consideration of *index'd* and not *index'd* added will give a farther advantage. *Nota speciatim*, n. 4. *Stephanus Byzantinus*, not *index'd*; in Dr. Bentley: not in Mr. Stanley, *vid. supr.* p. 54, 55.

The Second Decad of Proofs.

Proofs.
Pr. 11.

V. A Quotation out of the *Etymologicon*,
n. 12.

W. A Lexicographer, *Exc.* 1. *Index*, *Exc.*
2. in Spanheim, *Exc.* 5.

Pr. 12.

V. Out of *Stephan. Byzant.* n. 13.

W. *Just as before*, *Exc.* 1, 2, 5.

Pr. 13.

V. Another of the same, n. 14.

W. *Index*.

Pr. 14.

V. Out of the *Etymologicon*, n. 17.

W. *As Proofs* 11, 12. *Exc.* 1, 2, 5.

Pr. 15.

V. Out of *Stephanus Byzantinus*, n. 18.

W. Gruter's *Index*, *Exc.* 2. *vid. & supr.* p. 54, 55.

Pr. 16.

V. Out of the *Etymologicon* n. 19.

W. *Index'd and in Vulcanius*, *Exc.* 1, 2, 3.

Pr. 17.

V. A Quotation from *Didymus* upon *Homer*,
n. 20.

W. N. B. No Proof. Not in Mr. Stanley,
vide supr. Dec. 1. Rem. 1. p. 26, & c.

Pr. 18.

V. Out of the *Scholias*t upon *Sophocles*, n. 21.

W. A *Scholias*t, *Exc.* 1. in Spanheim, *Exc.*
5. *vide & supr.* p. 35.

V. Out

V. Out of *Priscian*, or *Hephæstion*, n. 27. Pr. 19.
W. *Index*, Exc. 2. *Spanheim*, Exc. 5.

V. Out of the *Etymologicon*, n. 28. Pr. 20.
W. *As Proofs*, 11, 12, 14, Exc. 1, 2, 5.

The Accounts of Decad the Second.

In Dr. Bentley, Quotations 23: in Mr. Stanley 10. or (perhaps) 11. In the Dr. *Corrections* and *Explications* 14. not in Mr. Stanley; though indeed several of these *Corrections* being but the same Emendation repeated (sc. 'Αρτίων into 'Αρτίων) I am content to discount half the number.

N. B. *Stephanus Byzantinus*, n. 13, 14. *index'd*; in Mr. Stanley. N. 15, 16, 23, 24, not *index'd*; in Dr. Bentley: not in Mr. Stanley.

The Third Decad of Proofs.

V. *Stephanus Byzantinus*, n. 29. Pr. 21.
W. *Index*.

V. *Stephanus Byzantinus*, n. 32. Pr. 22.
W. *Index*.

V. *Hephæstion*, n. 36. Pr. 23.
W. *Index*. Exc. 2. *Spanheim*, Exc. 5.

V. *Athenæus*, n. 37. Pr. 24.
W. *Index*, in *Vulcanius*, *Dacier*, and *Spanheim*, Exc. 2, 3, 5.

V. Another of the same, n. 38. Pr. 25.
W. *Answer the same*, Exc. 2, 3, 5.

- Pr. 26. V. *Etymologicon*, n. 40.
W. *Index*, Spanheim, as *Proofs* 11, &c. Exc.
1, 2, 5.
- Pr. 27. V. *Petronius Arbiter*, *ibid*.
W. *Dacier*, *inter Testimonia Veterum*, Exc 3.
- Pr. 28. V. *Suidas*, n. 41.
W. *Suidas*.
- Pr. 29. V. *Suidas*, n. 42.
W. *Suidas*.
- Pr. 30. V. *Suidas*, n. 43.
W. *Suidas*.

The Accounts of Decad the Third.

Quotations in Dr. Bentley between 30 and 40. in Mr. Stanley 10. Emendations and Explanations (direct and incidental) in Dr. Bentley about a dozen, of which, I presume, in Mr. Stanley none.

N. B. *Stephanus Byzantinus*, n. 29, 32. *index'd*; in Mr. Stanley. N. 30, 31, 33. *not index'd*; in Dr. Bentley: *not* in Mr. Stanley.

The Fourth Decad of Proofs.

- Pr. 31. V. *Suidas*, n. 44.
W. *Suidas*.
- Pr. 32. V. *Suidas*, n. 46.
W. *Suidas*.

V. A Quotation out of *Suidas*, with a reference to the *Scholiast* upon *Apollonius*, n. 49. Pr. 33.

W. Of *Suidas* enough already. As for the reference to the *Scholiast* upon *Apollonius Rhodius*, vid. *supr.* p. 35.

V. A Fragment out of *Athenæus*, (I suppose) Pr. 34. n. 50. (Q. is it out of *Suidas* too? vid. *supr.* p. 45, 52.)

W. *Index* to *Athenæus*, Exc. 2. in *Spanheim*, Exc. 5.

V. *Etymologicon*, n. 51.

Pr. 35.

W. *Index*, in *Vulcanius*, Exc. 1, 2, 3.

V. *Stephanus Byzantinus*, n. 51. (*repetitò.*) Pr. 36.

W. *Index*.

V. A Fragment from *Olympiodorus*, n. 52. Pr. 37.

W. In *Vulcanius*, and *Dacier*, Exc. 3.

V. *Etymologicon*, n. 53.

Pr. 38.

W. *Index*, *Vulcanius*, Exc. 1, 2, 3.

V. *Stephanus Byzantinus*, n. 54.

Pr. 39.

W. *Index*.

V. *Stephanus Byzantinus*, n. 55.

Pr. 40.

W. *Index*.

The Accounts of Decad the Fourth.

Quotations in *Dr. Bentley* between 30 and 40. in *Mr. Stanley* 10. (or perhaps one or two References more,) Emendations in *Dr. Bentley*

more than a dozen, of which there are three in Mr. Stanley, *sc.* those two (n. 49, 52. mentioned above, p. 22. *marg.* and a third of *ἐὺς* into *ἐὺς*, n. 46. which is also in Mr. Spanheim, p. 275. (*vid. Exc. 5.*) confirmed by Mr. Spanheim, with one Quotation from the Scholiast upon Homer, by Dr. Bentley with two from the same Scholiast, *vide & Except. 7.* In Dr. Bentley, Explications several, of which in Mr. Stanley, I presume, none.

These four *Decads* have taken in more than half of our *Vindicator's* Proofs. The Remainder of them I promised to dispatch by wholesale.

V. Num. 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 75, 77, 79, 82, 84, 86, 87, 92, 93, 96, —from Mr. Stanley.

W. N. 57. *Stephanus Byz. Index*, 58. *Hesychius, The very Store-house of the Dr's Alphabetical Learning.*
Supr. p. 9.

2. *Vide & Mr. B p. 157.* and Dr. B's Answer, *Pref. p. 80. & Epist. ad fin. Malel. cum passim, tum maxime p. 33, 34. & seqq.* 'Tis index'd. n. 59. *Suidas.* 60. *Nicandri Scholiastes, Exc. 1. vide & supr. p. 56. n. 65. Scholiast on Callimachus, Exc. 1.* But who'd have thought it? The Dr. so busie in collecting the Fragments of *Callimachus*, and making his Observations upon him; and yet not read the Scholiast on *Callimachus*? *Prodigy!* N. 66. *Suidas, Vulcanius, Dacier, Spanheim.* 67. *Etymologicon, index'd.* 68. *Suidas* and printed in all the Editions of *Callimachus.* 69. *Athenæus; index'd, Vulcanius, Dacier.* 71. *Suidas.* 72. *Athenæus, Index, Spanheim.* 75. *Stephanus Byz. index'd.* 77. *Scholiast upon Pindar, index'd, Dacier.* 79. *Zenobius,*

nobius, a known *Paræmiographer*, and the Dr. *Vid. & n.* is a great Dealer in Proverbs of all Languages, 360. especially Greek, Mr. B. p. 285. *supr. Concess.* 1. p. 7. n. 82. *Steph. Byzant. index'd, Spanheim.* 84. *Suidas.* 86. *Etymologicon, index'd, Vulcanius, Dacier, Spanheim,* (all with the Correction *πρ*). 87. *Clemens Alex. index'd, Spanheim, vid. & supr. p. 60. n. 92. Suidas.* 93. *Ammonius* *μετὰ λέξ.* a little *Alphabetical* piece of about an hour's reading and culling, printed at the end of *Scapula's Lexicon, Exc. 1. vide supr. p. 56. n. 96. Etymologicon, index'd, Vulcanius.*

The Dr's *some* Additions in this part of his Collection, *sc* from n. 57. p. 321. to n. 103. p. 355. are so numerous, and so very unproportioned to those few things in Mr. Stanley's MS. that there's no stating *Accounts* between them. And yet as I have (after our Vindicator's method) drawn up the *Numbers*, n. 57, 58, 59, &c. they make an handsome shew against him. But as for that, let the Reader see what hath been said before, p. 33. and let the Collator turn to n. 66, and consult Mr. Stanley's MS. p. 35. There he will find a little *Scrap* of a *Fragment* from out of *Suidas*. But the putting this *Fragment* into its proper *measures*, the correcting the *Etymologicon*, the reducing it to its proper place, the confirming it from *Tzetzes*, and from that place in *Plutarch*, from whence *Tzetzes* produces it; this is all the Dr's own. From all which it appears that this *Fragment* would have been in Dr. Bentley, though it had scaped all the other Collectors, *ut supr. p. 60.* Then follows in the Dr. about a Page and half of Quotations, Corrections, and Explications, of which but one Line, and that from the *Ety-*
F 4
mologicon,

mologicon, index'd, in Mr. Stanley; at least but that one line in this place. For I am apt to believe, that all the four Veries of this Fragment, n. 67. as from *Stobæus*, may be in Mr. Stanley, but misplac'd, *sc.* among the *Epigrams*. Then three Quotations in Mr. Stanley, *sc.* 68. out of *Suidas*, printed with all the Editions of *Callimachus*, 69. *Athenæus*, index'd, n. 71. a Fragment out of *Suidas*, corrected indeed by Mr. Stanley but crudely, and in such a manner as sufficiently shews how hastily and *incuriously* he drew up this *imperfect Draught*. For these three Quotations in Mr. Stanley, about as many Pages in Dr. Bentley. N. 75. in Mr. Stanley, one Quotation out of *Steph. Byzantinus*, index'd, in Dr. Bentley two out of the same *Lexicographer*, not index'd. Then in Dr. Bentley about 9 or 10 pages, small Letter and close print; for which only a little marginal Reference (by and by to be consider'd) in Mr. Stanley. From thence n. 76. p. 337. to n. 100 p. 345. He will find the Dr's *some* Additions bearing much the same proportion as before under the several *Decads*. After n. 96. p. 344. to n. 103. p. 355. The Dr's *some* Additions do so drown the *some* Quotations in Mr. Stanley's MS. that one must look very hard to get now and then a sight of one of them, saving some of the large Capitals, that is, the Titles of some of *Callimachus* his Works from *Suidas* and *Athenæus*, in Mr. Stanley, and in Dr. Bentley, and in *Vulcanius*, and in *Dacier*, and very few of them not in every Edition of *Callimachus*, that hath yet come from the Press, and yet, saith our *Vindicator*, transcribed from Mr. Stanley; Yes, transcribed from Mr. Stanley, in whom had not

not the Doctor met them, in vain had they been in every printed *Callimachus*.

Thus have I gone through all those Proofs of our *Vindicator*, which lie in the direct line, and examin'd them one by one. *I have consider'd them all with great Fairness, I am sure, and, Mr. B. p. I fear, with more exactness than they will be 181. thought to deserve.* And now, without mincing the matter, I dare boldly pronounce my self Victor in this Cause. No Reader, *I am sure*, that understands any thing of the Subject we are upon, can think any one of all these *Proofs* against the Dr. *Undeniable*. And as for him that understands nothing of it; let him hold his peace, and not run on (as has been of late the humour of the *Town*) claspouring upon Dr. Bentley for he knows not what. Only because Mr. B. hath the Talent of telling a Story very prettily, therefore Dr. B. is a *Dunce*, a *Clown*, a *Pedant*, and all the rest of Mr. B's Book.

But one demonstrative Argument you have against the Dr. not as yet so much as once touch'd upon by me: and that is the *method* in which his Collection is digested. The Dr's Fragments and Quotations are a great part of them printed in the very self same *order* and *method* in which they stand in Mr. Stanley's MS. And though two men might light upon the same Quotations, yet how should they hit upon it to set them down in the same order, without having written the one after the other? This indeed to a man that knows nothing of the matter bears the appearance of an Argument, and you seem to lay a great stress upon it.

I shall prove, say you, that Mr. Stanley's p. 32. Locks were pick'd, and his Trunks rifled; and that (among other things) Dr. Bentley's method

thod, in *Marshalling his Fragments*, was taken from that very *Learned Gentleman*. And in the next Page, But it's remarkable, that to manage the affair dextrously, Dr Bentley has in some places (it may be believ'd wilfully, and to conceal the Fraud) inverted the order of the MS. And much to the same purpose, but somewhat more satyrically, do you deliver your self, p. 78.

Now what is this *Method*? what deep contrivance was there in it, that Dr. Bentley could not have reach'd it himself? This *Method* is purely *Alphabetical*; that is, the several *Titles* of the lost pieces of *Callimachus* are set down in the order of the *Alphabet*; as, A. *πρὸς Ἀρσίνω*. B. *Βεργίχ*. Γ. *Γαλατεία*, &c. and under these *Titles* are placed the several *Fragments* or *Quotations* properly belonging to them. But there being many *Fragments* bearing no *Title*, nor carrying in them any plain Indication to what *Tracts* of that Author they belonged, these are thrown together promiscuously at the end of the other, under the common Character of *Fragmenta incerti loci*. This is that method which our *Vindicator* makes so strong an Argument against the Dr. than which, a more obvious thought could not have enter'd into any mans head, than to put things which have no dependance one upon the other into the order of the *Alphabet*. In this *Alphabetical* order, long before Mr. Stanley drew up his *imperfect Draught*, were collected and digested the *Fragments* of *Aristophanes*, *Æschylus*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, *Theophrastus*, *Varro*, *Nigidius Figulus*, *Lucilius*, and several others. So that the Dr. how natural soever it may be to him to transgress the Rules of *Method*, when he is solely under his

own Government ; yet he had here *Precedents* enough before him besides *Mr. Stanley's MS.* to have given him this lucky hint. And this I think may suffice for that mighty Argument of yours, the *regular Digestion* of his Fragments.

But it's very remarkable, that to manage the affair dextrously, *Dr. Bentley* has in some places (it may be believ'd wilfully, and to conceal the Fraud) inverted the order of the *MS.* But this, you say, will be remember'd in due time and place.

In the plain, unaffected *Stile*, Sir, nothing in the world could have been more nonsensically suggested. *Dr. Bentley* (to conceal the Fraud) takes the directest course in the world (had there been any *Fraud* in the matter) to have discovered it. For could he have laid himself more open to a Discovery, than by transcribing *Mr. Stanley's Method* ? and setting down his Quotations in such order, that every one that was so minded, might, without being at more pains for it, than just to turn over the Leaves one by one, trace him line by line ? *Dextrous management* ! Besides, what need at that time had the *Dr.* of such Precaution ? I presume, when that *MS.* was, in so friendly a manner, put into his hands, he had little apprehension of its being likely ever to be given in as evidence against him.

But he hath in some places inverted the order of the *MS.*

Yes, Sir, in some places ; and you have been pleased to mark them out : and such they are, as will at the same time sufficiently shew both what a precious Vindicator *Mr. Stanley's Manuscript* have met with, and how hastily that very Learned Gentleman (as the wisest men may do) committed

mitted his first Thoughts to his private Papers. But the name of Mr. Stanley is too well known to suffer any thing by such a Vindication.

Your Instances are these that follow.

V. *That Citation out of Stobæus, 'Αντ. δ, which Mr. Stanley hath given under the head *Em.*

W. But Mr. Stanley would never have printed it so as you have done it for him. That Citation begins,

Ἡγεστὸς δ' ὁ γέγων καὶν⊕ ἐλαφρότερον.

*Em are Hexameters, this is Elegiack. The Dr's Correction of ἐπῶν into Ἀντίων is certain; your Learned Story of the two Trincavells, p. 48 nothing to the purpose.

To this Class of the Dr's wilfull variations from Mr. Stanley's MS. on purpose to conceal the fraud belongs also that Omission of the Tit. Ἀγῶν Οἰκισμοῖ, Ἀρχαῖα, omitted (say you) by the Dr. for what reason I know not.

The case, I presume, exactly the same with that of Tit. Γλαῦκ⊕, *supr.* p. 38.

V. ΒΑΡΒΑΡΙΚΑ Νόμματα, *vind.* p. 40. So Suidas gives the title agreeable to Mr. Stanley's MS. (Mr. Stanley's MS. you mean, agreeable to Suidas) But Dr. Bentley having made the Citation his own, p. 249. hath inverted the order of the words, for what reason himself best knows.

W. I fanſie I can give a ſhrewd gueſs at his reaſon, ſc. becauſe ſuch Quotations ſtanding as Titles, whether in Indexes or elſewhere, muſt ſtand with the leading word (which is generally the Subſtantiue) foremoſt. Maſſacus in his *Differt. Critic. in Harpocrat.* cites this Title at leaſt a dozen times, and always with the word Νόμματα ſtanding firſt. So doth A. Schottus in his *Adagia*, p. 164. *not. in loc.* Callimachus in *Nomimis*

mimis Barbaricis. What *Fraud* were these two *Criticks* interested to conceal?

You have another of them, *p.* 43, 44. which happily afforded you the opportunity of bringing in that most *prodigiously* Learned *Parentthesis* of near a page long. I pass it over; leaving *Casaubon* and *Dr. Bentley* to maintain their ground against *your self* and *Natalis Comes*.

Dr. B's n. 192. is placed by *Mr. Stanley* under *Tit.* *Ἐλεγία*, probably, you say. But there's no other guessing at a *Probability* here, than than *Hephaestion* mentions it as an *ἔλεγιον*, that is, as his design there plainly implies, *Numero elegiaco*. It may have belonged to his *Epigrams* or any other piece of *Callimachus*, written in long and short Verse, as well as to his Book of *Elegies* properly so called: and therefore *Dr. B.* had reason to fling it amongst his *Fragm. inc. loci*.

V. The Quotation out of Steph. de Urbib. (vind. p. 52.) which *Dr. Bentley* hath omitted, but inserted in his *Notes on the entire Epigrams*.

W. And to them it belonged, *vid. Indicem in Stephan. v. Callimachus.*

V. Ibid, Dr. B. n. 103. The Fragment beginning *ὃ μὲν Ἄλκμ.* of which *Mr. Stanley* saith, *Cogitandum an non ad Ἀρτία hæc pertineant, an ad librum περὶ Ἀγώνων.*

W. It being but a *cogitandum an non*, it is still an *incertum*, and therefore properly placed by the *Dr.* amongst the *Fr. incerti loci*.

There is another of them also, *p.* 51. *sc.* *Dr. B's n.* 142. But upon that Fragment you having bestow'd some *Observations* of your own, at present I pass it by.

Dr.

Dr. B's n. 299. of which you say, p. 56. *under this Head* (sc. of IAMBOS & Χωλιαμβος) Mr. Stanley ranks Num. 299. in Dr. Bentley's *Collection*, *ad Choliambos isthac refero*. Certainly, Sir, you must have been mistaken in transcribing your MS. Mr. Stanley could never have held the Pen in his hand in so dreaming a condition, as to have written what you print upon him. Put on your *Critical Spectacles*, and look on your MS. again. Is it not *ad Iambos isthac refero*? That Fragment is only these three words, Τὸ δ' ἐχὼ σβας, which is manifestly the end of an *Iambick*. A *Choliambick*, Sir, always ends in two long Syllables. And yet thus it stands in your *second Edition*. No body takes any care of you.

P. 59. you have these words, *Why so plain a passage should be transported* (*transposed* another man would have said, but *Metaphors* are elegant) *let the Reader judge*.

Innuendo, to conceal the *Fraud*. This so plain a passage, (a passage so plainly belonging to the *Tit. περὶ ὄρνεων*, you mean) is in Dr. B. n. 321. Ἄλγεος ἀμφιγυῖαι, which Mr. Stanley with great judgment (say you) hath placed under the foresaid *Tit. de Avibus*. In great haste would another man have said. For *Callimachus* his Book of *Birds* was manifestly (as any one may collect from the Quotations referring to it produced by Dr. B. p. 349, 350.) written in *Prose*, and this Fragment is as manifestly the end of an *Hexameter*, as appears both from the Feet and the Epithet Ἀμφιγ. which is purely poetical. So that this Passage plainly appearing not to belong to the *Tit. περὶ ὄρνεων*; and it not appearing to what other piece it might belong,

Dr.

Dr. Bentley had good reason to throw it among the *Fr. incerti loci*.

An instance or two more, of this kind perhaps I may have overlooked : but these already produced, are, I think, sufficient to satisfy the Reader, that the Dr. might have some other reason for *inverting* (if he did ~~invert~~, or so much as took any notice of it) the order of your MS. Nor need I say more to this mighty Argument : the Dr's Collection stands in the same order as Mr. Stanley's. Being both drawn up *Alphabetically*, it must be so, as far as that Alphabetical method holds, and saving in some few places, where Mr. Stanley had not so properly disposed his Collections ; and there we find the Dr. hath *inverted* the order of the MS.

I was speaking e'en now of a *confident* man, and promis'd you a meeting again upon that point. Though I am somewhat in haste, I am unwilling to balk your Expectation. Let the Reader look over once again this List of Numbers.

Num. 11, 19, 34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 46, 51, 52, 53, 66, 67, 68, 72, 77, 86, 87, 92, 96.

These *Numbers* make up at least one third part of your direct *Number-Proofs* against the Dr. now let the Reader turn to *p. 20. Exc. 3.* Let him cast his Eyes over the several *Decads*, and that List of Numbers at the end of them, and observe how often he will find there the name of *Vulcanius* and *Dacier*. All and every one of these Numbers are to be met with in the one or the other of those printed Collections : and this methinks is somewhat *confidently* done of the Vindicator to charge them all upon the Dr. as stole from Mr. Stanley, *vid. supr. p. 72.*

One

One or two of them, Sir, to explain my meaning by, I shall single out for you.

P. 56. Upon Dr. B's n. 86. you have this Remark, *The third out of Plutarch with the Correction* πρδ, n. 86. i. e. Both n. 86. and the *Correction* πρδ, stole from Mr. Stanley. But, Sir, this *Correction* πρδ, is no Correction, nor is it taken from Mr. Stanley's MS. πρδ it is printed in all the Editions of *Plutarch*, πρδ it is printed in the *Scholias*t upon *Theocritus*, πρδ it is in *Vulcanius*, πρδ in *Dacier*, πρδ in *Spanheim*, πρδ it is I believe in all the Books you can show me, saving in the Text of the *Etymologicon* (or in other Books as directly transcribed from thence) where the *Lecti*on πρδς is manifestly corrupt, making neither Sense nor Verse, and accordingly was, long before Mr. Stanley's time corrected by *Sylburgius*, not in loc. And yet is this *Correction* πρδ charged by you upon the Dr. as stole from Mr. Stanley's MS. And have I not reason to say of you, that you are either a man of very little Reading, if you did not know this; or if you did know it, then I do not abuse you in giving you the character of a Person of a very singular Confidence.

To conclude with that which forced me upon making this Animadversion upon you. p. 46. *Elegia de com. Berenices*, Χαλύβων ὡς ἀπόλοιτο γένος, in Mr. Stanley, which Dr. Bentley, say you, without owning his Benefactor, hath confidently made his own. Have you never read any Books, Sir, but Mr. Stanley's MS? Is not this to affront your Reader? To suppose him so careless, so credulous, so unvers'd in Books, as not to know how very common this Quotation out of the *Scholias*t upon *Apollonius*, as apply'd to this

this very passage in *Catullus* is grown ever since the time of *Politian*? 'Tis printed in *Vulcanius*, *Miscellanti*, and in *Dacier's Callimachus*, in *Muretus*, in *Scaliger*, in the *Catullus cum not. var. In usum Delphini. Is. Vossii*. Nay, I very much question, whether there be a *Catullus* printed for above this hundred years, & with Notes upon him, in which this Quotation is wanting: which *Dr. Bentley*, without naming his Benefactor, has confidently made his own.

But there is another Quotation, Sir, just after this in *Dr. Bentley*, which though common enough in it self, yet as corrected and applied to another passage in this same Elegy in *Catullus*, perhaps you will not find in any body else save in the *Dr. sc. σὴν τε χεῖρην ὅμοσα σὸν τε εἶον*, quod sic latine vertit *Catullus*, v. 40. — *Adjuro teque tuumque caput*. And since he could out of his own Observation refer this later Fragment of *Callimachus* to its proper place in *Catullus*, which none before him had done; 'tis very probable, he would have done the like with the former himself, had he not been prevented by other hands.

To this Class of *Confidentisms* I shall also reduce another little parcel of the *Dr's Quotations*, and with them conclude this tedious work of counting *Figures*.

The Quotation out of *Suidas*, v. Διδραγμα. *Dr. B. p. 339.* out of *Harpocration*, v. ἰων, p. 352. Out of *Athenæus*, Tit. παντοδαπ. συγγραμ. p. 351. Out of *Clemens Alexandr. Tit. IAMBOI, & Χωλιαμβ. p. 337.*

All these Quotations also I find you charging upon the *Dr.* as taken from *Mr. Stanley*. But, Sir, every one of these Quotations are to

be met with in the Dr's *Epist. ad fin. Malel.* And that Epistle was printed before he ever saw your MS. I need not paraphrase any farther upon this. *vid. supr. p. 20. Exc. 4.* You must give the Dr. leave, Sir, to play the *Plagiary* a little upon himself.

Vide Mr. B. p. 192. confer cum Dr. B's epist. ad fin. ad Malel. lin. 1. Memini. His Dissertation at the end of Mr. *Wotton*; *lin. 1. I remember. vide & seqq. M. T. Ciceronis Epistolas. ad Fam. lib. 7. ep. 28. Memini. & lib. 5. ep. 13. Quanquam. lib. 10. ep. 19. Quanquam. & lib. 5. ep. 16. Et si, ibid. ep. 18, 19. Et si. & lib. 6. ep. 12. Gratulor tibi. ibid. ep. 15. Tibi gratulor. & lib. 7. ep. 19. vide quanti, lib. 16. ep. 5. vide quanta. & fam. lib. 7. ep. 27. Miror. ad Attic. lib. 13. ep. 10. Minimè miror. ad Attic. lib. 13. ep. 35. O rem indignam! ibid. ep. 38. O incredibilem vanitatem!*

P. 32. As to the Dr's numerous *Coincidencies* with Mr. *Stanley* in his Quotations of the Ancients, I think, I have given a tolerably fair account of them. But you have not yet done with him. There are still behind his Notes and Animadversions upon this Poet, a *great part* of which, you assure us, *are taken from that very Learned Gentleman.* If you could make out this, you would do somewhat. But this *great part* you speak of, I am inclined to believe the Collator will find to be scarce one in fifty, and those *very few*, wherein they do concur to be either such with which the *Index* here also supply'd Mr. *Stanley*, or else so very obvious in themselves, that no man tolerably vers'd in these sorts of Studies could have miss'd of them, *vid. supr. Exc. 7.* As you have been mercifull to the

the Dr. upon this point, and not over-loaded him with *Numbers*, I will take them in order one by one, as you have given them.

V. In the Dr's note on the *Hymn in Jov.* P. 69. (v. 3. p. 458.) the Correction of Πηλαγόνων into Πηλαγόνων, upon the Authority of the *Etymologicon*, and *Hesychius*; from Mr. Stanley.

W. Index'd in the *Etymologicon*, who sent him in course to the same word in *Hesychius*. Besides the Quotations from these two *Lexicographers*, Dr. Bentley hath seven more. Qu. how many of them in the MS? A correction of the Text of *Hesychius*, sc. γέγοντες into γίγαντες. Qu. Is that also in Mr. Stanley? Qu.

V. The Correction of ἀνίσταται into ἀνίστα. *Ibid.* ηται, upon the Authority of the *Scholiast* upon *Callimachus*, of *Aldus*'s his Edition, and of the like examples from *Callimachus* himself; all transcribed from Mr. Stanley's excellent Notes.

W. This seems to be spoken somewhat too confidently. May not the Dr. have seen *Aldus*'s his Edition of *Callimachus*? May he not have read over the *Scholiast* on *Callimachus*? May he not have transcribed those passages out of *Callimachus* from *Callimachus* himself? The Dr. acknowledges *Frobenius* his Edition also, gives an Authority out of *Homer*, offers a second Conjecture upon the Text of *Callimachus*, with a Grammatical reason for it. Is all this transcribed from Mr. Stanley? Yes, all you say. Qu. Supr. p. 70.

V. His third Note of the same *Hymn* is much of the Complexion with that of Mr. Stanley, as are others that follow.

W. Those that follow make up near eight pages. Are they all in Mr. Stanley? or the greatest part of them? or any of them? For

in saying, they are *much of the Complexion with those of Mr. Stanley*, you speak as much nothing as 'tis possible for a man to speak. Either they are the same, or they are not the same. If the same; undoubtedly we should have heard of it: if not the same with Mr. Stanley, not transcribed from him. That two men, well vers'd in the same sort of Studies, writing upon the same Subject, should not in some, nay in many Instances, hit upon much the same things is next to impossible; which makes me wonder, that even the first strokes of Mr. Stanley's Pen should not, throughout the whole, have afforded you more instances of this kind against the Dr. *vid. supr. Exc. 7. p. 21.* But a very small variation in matters of this nature, be it but of a Word, or Syllable, or Letter or two, gives a clear different *Complexion* to the whole. After a leap of 8 pages in comes Mr. Stanley again with

V. The Correction of *Isav* into *Isa*, *not. in Hymn Lavacr. Pallad, Dr. B. p. 466.*

W. The sense absolutely required this Correction; 'twas to a man never so little vers'd in these Studies, an easie and obvious Correction. The Dr. gives the *Grammatical* reason for it, and confirms it by two or three Authorities for the like mode of Expression: Q. Are they *all* in Mr. Stanley?

V. Dr. B. *not. ibid. in v. 130.* A Quotation out of the *Etymologicon magnum* with another out of *Laetantius*.

W. Both which the Dr's own *Industry* may have supply'd him with, as well as it did with the other Quotations to the same purpose from *Athenaus, Hesychius, Nicander*, with the *Epigram*

gram out of *Gruter's* Inscriptions, an exquisite Correction and Explication of that *Epigram*, attempted, but not with like Success by *Scaliger*.
 Q. Are all these things in *Mr. Stanley*? *Mr. Spanheim's* Notes upon the same passage are much of the same Complexion. Had he also the hint from your MS? *v. Exc. 5. supr. p. 20.* P. 642.

Toward the lower end of the third page following, we meet with *Mr. Stanley* again.

V. In *Dr. B's* Notes in *Hymn in Cerer. v. 133. p. 469.* a Correction of the Text upon the Authority of the *Etymologicon*, and *Hesychius*, and of an old Edition of *Callimachus*. P. 70.

W. Index'd in the *Etymologicon*; to turn to *Hesychius* in the same word was no very laborious Search; in consulting the several Editions of Books *Dr. Bentley* is not less curious than was *Mr. Stanley*. In the *Dr.* I find the *Etymologicon* it self twice corrected; the Grammatical Analogy of the word *ἑυνμία* very nice and particular; a Quotation out of *Eusebius*; a Censure upon *Luc. Holstenius*, his mistaken Correction of that passage in *Eusebius* in his Notes upon *Porphry*; a very pertinent Quotation from *Theocritus*, with an *Epigram* of *Crinagoras* never before published. Qu. Are all these things in *Mr. Stanley*?

Thus much for the *Dr's* Notes and Animadversions upon the *Hymni*, wherein the accounts between him and *Mr. Stanley* stand thus. The *Dr.* hath upward of 12 pages, for which I very much question, whether the *Collator* will find so many lines in *Mr. Stanley's* MS. and even of them, the first hint (as to the greatest part of them) taken from the *Index* to the *Etymologicon*, and pursued by turning to the same word in

Hefychius. As for the Dr's *Notes* and *Animadversions* upon the other part of this *Poet* (as his *Epigrams* and *Fragments*) I pretty confidently presume they will be found to exceed the MS. in yet a far greater proportion. And yet hath our *Honest Vindicator* the *Confidence* to say of the Dr's *Notes* and *Animadversions*, a *great* part of them taken from *Mr. Stanley*. Not a line for a page, one place with another, I dare say. I am not able to comprehend the nicety of your distinction between *Notes* and *Animadversions*. A *great* part of his *Notes*, you say, and *some* of his *Animadversions*. But taking them in both together, of the Dr's I know not how many *Scores* of curious and (if we may believe *Grævius*) very valuable *Notes* and *Animadversions* upon the *Epigrams*, I do not find so much as *one* charged upon him as borrowed from *Mr. Stanley*: of his I know not how many *Scores* of the same upon the *Fragments* within the line of your comparison, as far as I can recollect, but *four*; three of them already accounted for; *sc.* that of ἀλλά into ἔλα, of βῆς σῶ into βεωσῶ, and that of δένδρον into δένδρεον in this Quotation out of the *Scholiast* upon *Apollonius*.

— Ναὶ μὰ τὸ ῥικνὸν

Σύφας ἐμὸν, καὶ τὶ τοτὸ δένδρεον αὖτον εἶναι περ.

Scan the Verse, Sir. (*vid. & supr. p. 22, 70.*) To which you have here added a *Fourth*.

V. The Critick upon N. 85. is taken from *Salmasius de Usuris*, p. 494.

W. That Book, *Salmasius de Usuris* I have not by me, and therefore can say nothing to it.

N. Only the Dr. reads ὅκω for ἔκω, which might have been spared.

W. Which

P. 32.

Proem. p.
5.

W. Which might have been spared ! So far from that, that the whole stress of the *Correction* lies upon that very word $\delta\kappa\epsilon$, without which there's no sense to be made of that Fragment. And the Correction $\delta\kappa\epsilon$ you allow to be the Dr's own. As for the other part of the Correction, of $\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$ into $\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\epsilon$ he took it (with the easiest change imaginable) from *Vossius* MS. *vid. loc. n. 85. Dr. B. p. 339.*

From *n. 85.* you take a leap to *n. 148.* Was it out of the *mercifulness* of your Inclinations that you were so forbearing of the Dr. or for want of matter against him? He that is half so well acquainted with you as I am, will suspect the latter. P. 26.

V. The Reading $\eta\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\omicron\iota$, *n. 148.* is from the P. 72. same Author.

W. 'Tis not from the same Author, Sir ; But from *Helladius*, in whose very words and syllables the Dr. gives this Lesson, *Corrigenda sunt ex Helladio.* The Correction is of $\delta\iota\omicron\iota$ into $\eta\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\omicron\iota$. Scan the Verse again. 'Tis an Elegiack.

$\Phi\omicron\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\delta\omicron\iota\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\iota\ \eta\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\omicron\iota.$

Now from *n. 148.* another leap to *n. 242.*

V. $\Sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\gamma\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ for $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$, *n. 242.* which Dr. Bentley assumes (to himself, should have been added) is taken from the MSS. of *Ammonius.* P. 72.

W. Were I in company with you, I would ask you, how many MSS. of *Ammonius* have you seen ? I believe you mean, from *Ammonius* in the MS. *sc.* in Mr. Stanley's MS. not MSS. Such little scapes of the Press your Book is full of.

The *Lection συνημματα* was natural, easie, unavoidable, ready pointed out to him in the *Etymologicon*, and in *Ammonius* himself.

Thus have you done with all the Dr's *Notes* and *Animadversions* stole from Mr. *Stanley*. Which what they are both for *Number* and *Quality*, let the Reader judge, and the Collator farther inquire into. You go on.

V. To which I shall add a probable Correction or two of some other Fragments.

W. Very opportunely ! And so have you fairly brought me to those

Observations of your own.

P. 2. Which I promised you to set in a place by themselves : and 'tis pity I cannot afford them more Room, for they are most incomparable things.

P. 72. V. *Num* 128. Suppose it were read thus, ἀνέε, τε ἰδίδαι, & *silentes sedere*, *Hesych.* ἀνεοῖ, ἡσχοῖ, ἀσχοῖ And the *Pythagorean* Silence is too well known to be disputed.

V. *Lucian.* *Μακρόβ.* *versus fn.* W. 'T would be a dangerous thing for a person of that old *Comic Poet*, *Philemon's* Constitution, to read such a piece of *Criticism* as this. Or was it your design to print a *Banter* upon your self? For had a man premeditated how to write learned Nonsense, he could not have done it more effectually. The Fragment here spoken of is taken from *A. Gellius, lib. 4. c. 11.* who introduces it thus, *Opinio vetus falsa occupavit & convaluit, Pythagoram*—— “ It hath been of a long time a current Tradition, but false, “ that *Pythagoras* the Philosopher abstained “ from eating the Flesh of Animals, and from Beans.

“ Beans. ’Twas in *Conformity* to this vulgar *Ex hac o-*
 “ Error, that *Callimachus* wrote these two *pinione.*
 “ Verses.

Καὶ κυδμων ἀπὸ χεῖρας ἔχειν ἀνιώντων ἴδεσαι

Κ’ αὖθ, Πυθαγόρας ὡς ἐκέλευε, λέγων.

In the first of these lines the word ἀνιώντων is a manifestly false *Lectio*, and makes no possible sense. So that there being a necessity of some Correction, *Stephanus* gives it thus, ἔχειν [ἐ] ἀναιμων] ἴδεσαι. Dr. Bentley thus, ἔχειν [ἀβίωτα τ’] ἴδεσαι. These two Corrections of the Dr. and *Stephanus* agree in exactly the same sense; and which offers the less violence to the Text, the Eye may judge. After them both comes our judicious Vindicator with his Correction And what’s that? why, ἀνέες τε ἴδεῖσθαι, & *silentes sedere*: for ἀνέες in *Hesychius* is ἀφῶνοι, *silentes*; and the Pythagorean Silence is too well known to be disputed. But, good Sir, what signifies the Pythagorean Silence to the Pythagorean Abstinence, the only thing here spoken of, which you are content to drop as nothing to the purpose. ’Tis a wonder to me how such a piece of Criticism should enter into an head that has Brains in it. A. Gellius is producing a couple of Verses directly relating to *Pythagoras* his supposed Abstinence from Flesh: by the help of your Correction they no more relate to it, than they do to his Golden Thigh. What an easie thing were it for me here to ask you an *insulting* question or two? but I’ll not be *unmannerly*.

V. I am sure ἀβίωτον in Dr. Bentley’s sense is a pure *Anglicism*, and I cannot think that *Callimachus* pretended to our Language.

W. Were I the spitefullest man that ever took Pen in hand, I could not retort this Accusation

*Rara qui-
dem, fate-
or, est, ea
verbi sig-
nificatio:
sed, &c.*

on upon you. I must do you that Justice to confess, that of all the Books I have ever seen in *our Language*, I never yet read one with fewer *Anglicisms* in it than yours. That the Signification here given to the word ἀβίωτος is uncommon, Dr. B. owns; but withal observes, that *Callimachus* was a great Innovator in Language; and that *Suidas* after the more common interpretation of the word, gives it this less usual one; ἀβίωτος, ὁ μὴ ζῶν. *Callimachus* therefore being a great Innovator in Language, and *Suidas* having manifestly some-where or other met with this word used in this sense; 'tis not improbable, but that in writing his *Lexicon* he might have this very passage of *Callimachus* in his Eye: an Author whom he refers to more than once without express mention of his name, *vid. supr. p. 45. & speciatim Suidam, v. παλαῖος, conf. cum Dr. B. n. 48.*

V. Num. 200. Dr. Bentley reads it, καὶ μόνος &c. & solus adolescentum comedeat tutorem, (one of the worst of crimes and worthy the Dr's considering.)

W. What a biting *Parentthesis* is here? Wit and Satyr all over. But suppose a man should ask you the question; what *Thought*, Sir, what *Meaning* had you in your Mind when you wrote it down? Could you answer him?

V. But suppose we read, καὶ Κρόνον αἰζώων ἑρπετὸν.

αἰζώων
there is,
not αἰζώ-
&c. I que-
stion, whe-
ter αἰς be
ever con-
tracted in-
to αἰ.

W. But suppose there be no such Greek word as αἰζώων, then I suppose we must not read it so. And if you cannot maintain your αἰζώων, then your Κρόνον falls to the ground of course, and with Κρόνον your *Julius Firmicus*, and with *Julius Firmicus* your known *Story* of *Saturn's* devouring

devouring the *Immortal* Infants before they were a day old. And thus I think your second *Correction* is as insignificant as your first was ridiculous.

To fetch in the rest of those learned Observations of your *own*, I must return to the beginning of your Indictment.

V. Dr. B's Correction of *Fulgentius Plancia*- P. 35. *des* was needless.

W. That Correction was *none* of the Dr's. The Dr's words are, *viri eruditi emendant*. So that if it was *needless*, those *learned men* are to blame, not Dr. B. But why was it needless?

V. For why should he cite a faulty Edition?

W. The Dr. cites it from the Edition of *Jos. Mercerus*, Par. 8vo. 1612. which all men of Learning esteem as the best Edition of that Author. *Gothofred* did well in correcting the *sense* of his Author, but in supplanting his *words*, and making his *own* Conjecture (though just) part of the Text of his Author, he exceeded the Bounds of a Commentator. The Dr. could have done the like upon *Malela*; but he better understood the Laws of *Critick*. Another little *shrivell'd* Observation you have here, at which I cannot afford to make a stop. *Perhaps* there's nothing in it.

If any Bookseller's Shop in Town could present me with a page more *fruitfull* of mistakes than is your 38th and 39th, it must be Mr. *Benner's*; but I'll defie even *his* to match you here. Passing by your unintelligible (I am sure 'tis so to me) Story of *that old* Edition (you are speaking of *Hephæstion*) and *this last*; and your idle Cavil upon a scape of the *Dutch* Printer, in putting a *v* for an *u*, I come to your own Remarks

marks, or at least those which you espouse and make your own.

P. 38.

Lib. 3. v.

479.

V. The Dr's Quotation out of *Terentianus Maurus* was long since cited by *Lactantius* in his Notes on *Statius* his *Thebais*, and much more correctly, and to better purpose, thus, *Branchi meminit Terentianus de metris,*

Hymnum Branchiade Phæbo —.

W. Let the Reader, if he pleases, see it at length in your Book, and compare it with the Dr's out of *Terentianus* himself, n. 36.]

Much more correctly, you say, *and to better purpose*. How a Quotation could be more *incorrectly* given, and to *less* purpose, is scarce to be imagined. If any Mortal can make either Sense or Grammar of it, as it stands in that *Lactantius*, I'll lose the whole cause.

P. 39.

V. For as the Verses are now read, I cannot excuse them: Chronology it self cannot defend them.

W. *Chronology!* — Stuff.

Ibid.

V. For *Branchus* could not sing an Hymn of *Callimachus*.

W. Nor could you construe *Terentianus*, which therefore I'll do for you.

Nec non & memini, pedibus quater his repetitis, Hymnum Battiadem Phæbo cantâsse Jovique Pastorem Branchum: quem —

Nec non & memini, And I also remember, *Battiadem*, that *Callimachus*, *cantâsse*, composed, *Hymnum, pastorem Branchum*, an Hymn (called) *Branchus* the Shepherd, *pedibus quater his repetitis*, with these *~~~~* Choriambick feet four times repeated, *Phæbo Jovique*, in praise of *Jupiter* and *Apollo*. And though *Chronology* will not admit *Branchus*, who liv'd so many years

years before *Callimachus*, to have sung an *Hymn* composed by *Callimachus*, yet *Callimachus* may have composed an *Hymn* in praise of *Jupiter* and *Apollo*, and given to that *Hymn*, from, 'tis probable, the principal *Fable* of it, the Title of *Branchus*. And of that very *numerical Hymn* there is scarce any doubt to be made, but that this *Fragment* was part, and probably the first verse, it being in that *Metre Terentianus* speaks of, and with express mention of *Jupiter* and *Apollo*.

Δαῖμόνες εὐ-ἡμυῶτάτοϊ- φοῖβέ τέ καϊ- Ζεῦ Δῖδ' ἡμῶν-
γένηεχαϊ.

Here's the *Pentameter*, which *Hephæstion* and *Terentianus* speak of, after the 4 *Choriambics* ending in a *Bacchius*.

V. *Branchus*, says the same Commentator, *Ibid.* was a *Thessalian*. *Branchus Thessalus fuit, dilectus Apollini* — *illinc Branchiades Apollo dilectus*.

W. But here this same beloved Commentator of yours is no less than twice mistaken. First, *Branchus* was not a *Thessalian*, but a *Milesian*: *vide inter Historiæ Poeticæ scriptores Conon. Narrat. 33, & 44.* and *Bernartius in loc.* takes notice of *Lucretius* (al. *Lactantius*) as the only Authority for *Branchus* his having been a *Thessalian*. Nor secondly, was *Apollo* ever call'd *Branchiades*, though you will find it so in some *Lexicographers* and *Epithet-mongers*, into whose hands it first came from this *Lactantius*, and so pass'd downward by *Transcription*. I find it in *Hoffman*, but *Baudrand* hath rectified this mistake. For *Apollo* to have been call'd *Branchiades*, or rather *Branchides*, he must have been the Son, not the Father of *Branchus*. For that

Statii oper. Par. 4to. 1618, Vol. 1. p. 143.

that termination — *ids* or — *ids*, determines the *Patronymick* to the Descendants. There was indeed an *Oraculum* called from the Successors of *Branchus Beryxidas* or *Beryxidas*: but *Apollo*, as related to that Oracle, took his name from the place of it, *Didymaus*. As is imply'd in this very Fragment.

Ibid.

V. I question not therefore, but that *Branchiades* is the better reading.

W. And I as little question, but that the reading *Branchiades* is most ridiculously absurd.

Ibid.

V. It carries its own Credentials with it.

W. It carries its own Confutation with it. It is against Grammar, Chronology, and common Sense; has been long since condemned by *Brodæus* in his Notes on the *Anthology*, lib. 3. cap. 23. and by *Nic. Brissæus Montevillarius* in his Notes upon the passage in *Terentianus* now produced, *Paris*, 4to. 1531. Never, I believe, approved of by any man before your self.

Ibid.

V. Nor is there any need of playing the Corrector, and changing *quum* into *quem*.

W. So much need of it, that without changing *quom* into *quem* (an easie change), there's no construing those Lines.

Ibid.

V. And to this head I question not, but the Quotation, p. 337. in the Dr's Collection ought to be referred.

W. And upon this point I question not, but that you are again as much as ever mistaken. For most certain it is, That that Quotation cannot belong to this head. For this Poem called *Beryx* was all of it written in that sort of *Pentameter* just before mentioned, and therefore the Quotation, p. 337. which is *Hexameter*, cannot

not belong to this Head. As *Virgil's Tityrus* being all of it written in *long Verse*, that cluster of short ones, *sic vos non vobis*—— cannot belong to his *Tityrus*. Had you construed that *Greek* you transcribed to the Press in the page just before, you could not have fallen into P. 38. this mistake. Καὶ τῷ πνταμίτῳ Καλλίμαχῳ
 ὁ ΟΑΟΝ ποῖνμα ἔβραχυν συνέδνη, Δαίμονες
 ἐν---

I think you have made me work enough in one page: what have we in the next? why another, I question not.

V. The Book (Νόμιμα Βασιλεῖα) was written, (I question not) after the example of *Aristotle*, whose Treatise under that Title is cited by *Varro*. P. 40.

W. This is brought in for no other end or purpose, but to create in the Reader a good opinion of your Learning. And therefore purely for the humour-sake, I shall tell him that this Learned Remark is *Scaliger's* in his Notes upon *Varro*, which our Vindicator, without naming his Benefactor, has confidently made his own. And yet whether or no *Varro* did indeed cite any Treatise of *Aristotle* under that Title, is still a question. The Copies of *Varro* have it *Nomina*, and the *Nomima* is but a Conjectural Emendation of *Scaliger*, which though not improbable, yet is it not altogether unquestionable. See the fore-mention'd *Mausaci Dissert. Critic. in Harpocrat.*

V. *Natalis Comes*, n. 45.

W. I'll have no concerns with *Natalis Comes*. P. 45.
mes, sup. p. 77.

V. *Foannes Franciscus Trincavellus*, — *Victor Trincavellus*, — *Cardinal Bembo*, — with a *Tristich*. W. A

W. A *Tristich*, beginning with a short Verse.
sed vid. supr. p. 76.

V. The Dr. hath, I doubt not, *studiously* omitted those *entire* Epigrams which had been collected by [Himself and] others ———.

W. Here the [Himself and] is added in your second Edition; the only instance I have observed in you of a *second Thought*. But a strange kind of *Omission* this, methinks; the *Omission* of the Epigrams collected by *Himself*: and *n. b.* collected by *Himself*; *q. d.* not by others, *ergo* the Collection his *own*, *ergo*, not stole. Your meaning, I suppose, is he *studiously* omitted the inserting these *entire* Epigrams among the *Fragments*, and, to conceal the *Fraud*, placed the *entire* Epigrams among the *entire* Epigrams. *Studiously*, I doubt not. This ought to have been referred to the *Class* of *Transportations*, *supr. p. 78.*

P. 50.

V. A Critick so curious in what did not belong to his Poet.

W. The name of *Callimachus* did belong to his Poet: which *name* therefore being falsely ascribed to a wrong person, 'twas no unnecessary Curiosity in the Dr. but full to the Subject he was upon, to rectifie that mistake: for which a man less litigious than your self, would have thanked him.

ibid.

V. The Dr. might have been so carefull as to have acquainted the Learned World with what was genuine and presumed to be truly his Authors.

W. Which the Dr. hath amply done. But is that *Latin* Epigram you are here speaking of in Mr. *Juret's* Collection of *Epigrammata vete-*

rum genuine, and truly *Callimachus's*? If you can have had any other meaning in this than purely the contradicting *Dr. Bentley*, it must have been a very *filly* one: and in that you all along come off so *scurvily*, I hope we shall hear no more of you.

V. *Natalis Comes*, Καλλιόπη σοφίην.

Ibid.

W. I tell you again, I'll have nothing to do with *Natalis Comes*.

V. Mr. Stanley having ———.

P. 51.

W. Here begins a *Paragraph*, but where it ends I know not, nor how to construe it. 'Tis big of *Accusations* against the *Dr.*

V. Mr. Stanley reckons the *Dr's* n. 142. among the *Fragments* of the *Epigrams*; which seems very likely.

W. But for what reason, Sir, doth it seem so? I see none.

V. And that the Title of this *Epigram* was *Ibid.*
ἐπὶ τῇ Λιοντείας δερμῆς, as *Suidas* avers.

W. Whether your meaning be, upon the skin of a *Lion*, or upon the skin of *Leontius*, (for either or neither of these you may mean, for ought I know) *Suidas* avers neither the one nor the other. The *Greek* Preposition ἐπὶ, Sir, in this place signifies *de* (*de pelle*) not *in* (*in pellem*.) And all that *Suidas* avers, is, that the word σκῆλα is sometimes apply'd to the skin of a *Lion*, or that the skin of a *Lion* is sometimes called in *Greek* by the name of σκῆλα. For which signification of the word he produces the Authority of *Callimachus* in this Fragment. This is all that *Suidas* means, Sir, by his ἐπὶ τῇ Λιοντείας δερμῆς.

V. As his despised *Emilius Portus* had corrected his Author.

H

W. 'Tis

W. 'Tis no presumption in Dr. Bentley to despise *Amilius Portus*.

Ibid.

V. Dr. Bentley takes it from *Amilius Portus*.

W. Dr. Bentley takes it *not* from *Amilius Portus*.

Ibid.

V. Not to mention the Doctor's changing σκῶλ into σκῶλον.

W. The Dr. does *not* change σκῶλ into σκῶλον. This Fragment stands in two Authors: in *Suidas*, and in the *Scholiast* on *Sophocles*. In *Suidas* it is given with the word σκῶλ; and therefore with the word σκῶλ from *Suidas* did Mr. Stanley transcribe it. In the *Scholiast* on *Sophocles* it stands with the word σκῶλον; and so from him hath the Dr. given it. So that the Dr. did *not* change σκῶλ into σκῶλον, but as he found it in his Author; so without any change at all he wrote it down.

V. Whereas both words are genuine.

W. And therefore the Dr. might use either of them. *Qu.* Is not this cavilling?

P. 52.1

V. That the Reader may judge whether the Corrections, Ἀλητιάδαι, ἦ, Ἐφύρη, be Dr. Bentley's, I will transcribe the Fr. n. 103. from the MSS. [MS. write like a Scholar.]

Καὶ μὲν Ἀλητιάδαι πᾶσι χερσὶ ὄτρυν.

Τότ' ἔτι παρ' ———.

W. I do judge that Dr. Bentley took *not* those Corrections from Mr. Stanley's MS. As for the Ἀλητιάδαι, the Verse required that *Lection*, and I do judge that Dr. Bentley knew the Rules of the Greek *Prosody* before he saw Mr. Stanley's MS. As for the other two Corrections (ἦ and Ἐφύρη) the Dr. hath many very material variations from your MS. upon which

which *variations* from your MS. those two Corrections altogether depend; in Conjunction with which therefore they must have been made. The Dr. comes nearer to *Junius* his Lektion, ^{Had Junius Animad. lib. 4 c. 21.} than to that of your MS. And therefore if we must suppose him to have been beholding to either of them, it was to the former. The mistaken Lektion of your MS. *χερσὶ τῶν*, ^{Gruter, Vol. 4.} *lin. 1.* *τῶνδε*, *lin. 2.* make its true Lektion 'Εφύρη *lin.* last of no use, and in the same last line the Lektion *ἀγωνισαί*, (as you have given it) can never be brought to bear either Sense or Construction. But the Dr. having established every one of his Lektions upon Reasons and Authorities rendring them certain, hath thereby made all the parts of the Fragments consistent, and given a very learned and perspicuous Explication of it; which according to the Lektions of your MS. could never have been done. So that upon the whole, my Judgment is, That the Dr. was no more beholden to Mr. Stanley for his 'Αλητιάσαι, ἦ and 'Εφύρη here, than he was for his 'Εχέλυ, δένδρεον and βουκό before. ^{Supr. p 70; &c.} But this is the way of you; 'tis but *arming* forth your Pages with a set of Greek words against the Dr. and throwing them off with a *confident Turn*; and so, with your Readers, the work's done.

V. The Reader is left to compare the Dr's *Ibid.* 2, 7 out of *Suidas*, beginning with these words, — *ἔστι τὸ γέμμα*, &c. with the same Fragment in Mr. Stanley's MS. beginning with these words, *ἡ δὲ δὴ δ' ἔστι τὸ γέμμα λέγον*; and to pass his judgment upon the Dr's Assertion, *Quæ antea corruptissima feliciter nunc restituimus.*

W. And my judgment is, that the Dr. had very good grounds for his Assertion. Dr. Bentley's Lektion comes much nearer to the Text in *Suidas* : and there be almost as many flaws as lines in Mr. Stanley's. He begins with a too licentious Inversion of the order of the words ; his second line *Τὶδν Ληοπρεπῆς* — were there no Exception lay against the Grammar of it, runs, methinks, very heavy and *unpoetical*.

Τὶδν Ληοπρεπῆς κῆσθαι ἢ Κῆτον ἀνδρῶν.

The word *κῆτον* would not make *κῆτων* Verse 4th, but *κῆτων*. The Conjunction *αἶσας* (so I suppose it should have been printed) seems in this place somewhat too *impetuous* for the Verb *ἄλιδεν*, to which it cleaves, besides that it is a farther departure from the Text (*αἶσας*;) instead of which, the Dr's Interjection of Lamentation *αἶ ἄ*, seems to be demanded by that expression of *Suidas* *ΟΙΚΤΙΖΕΤΑΙ Καλλίμαχος τὸ ἀδισμον ἔχρον*, which I take to be as much as *miserabiliter representat*. What Mr. Stanley means here by his *μεγάλας σκοπῆδας*, I know not. But Dr. Bentley hath given us a fair account of his *μεγάλας Σκοπῆδας*. Such is the Justice which is done to the *Manes* of the Deceased, when their Papers are put into the hands of them that know not how to use them. But 'tis no Imputation to any man that his first thoughts are not correct.

Besides, Sir, if Dr. Bentley were such a *Plagiary* as you would have us believe of him, what a Prize had here been for him ? And why did he not make hast off with it, and forthwith to *beating* about again for more Prey ? That's the way of them that live upon the Plunder. What another instance have you here given us of your un-

unskilfull management? So often telling us of his *transcribing* your MS? So fully demonstrating how little he regarded it? The character upon which you spend the former part of your Book, a *most supercilious Corrector*, is not very consistent with what you give us in the latter part of it, a *most notorious Plagiary*. Who'd imagine both these belonged to the same man?

V. In *n.* 86. the Correction of *Διαρρέας* *Mñ*-P. 56. *α*⊙, was long since made to his hands.

W. Nor doth the Dr. lay any claim to that Correction. But [the Observation that that fault in the Copies of *Plutarch* had been of so long standing as to have misled *Eusebius* and *Theodoret* the (former of which *Prap. Evang.* l. 13. and the later *Therapeut. Græc. Ser.* 2. follow that corrupt Lecture of *Διαγ. ὁ Μιλήσιος*) and consequently the rectifying the mistakes of those Ancient Writers, this was the Dr's own.

V. And whether *Χάλλειον* be not a genuine *Ibid.* Reading, and *Ψύπης* be not as likely as *Ψύχης*, I refer him to *Sam. Petits Miscellan. observat.* l. 1. c. 2. p. 9, 10.

W. And I refer him to *Richardus Bentleius*, in *not. ad Fragmenta Callim. num.* 86. p. 340. For, Sir, do you think your so often saying, *I refer the Reader to*, &c will pass any where, but among *your selves*, for a Confutation of Dr. Bentley? Though this *Sam. Petit* being a Critick from whom as little is to be learn'd, as from any of those whose Books have the good luck to bear a price, I am apt to believe you may have read him.

V. *Callimachus* may have written a *Tragedy* P. 65. 66. called *Dædalus*, of which *Tragedy*, this Fragment, (*n.* 305.) may have been part.

W. No, Sir, that *cannot* be. But that you were resolved to be an *Author*, you might, perhaps, have pass'd for a *Scholar*. This *Fragment* is part of an *Hexameter*, a sort of *Mètre* which a very moderate *Antiquarian* would have told you the Ancients never made use of in *Tragedy*.

Ἐν δὲ λαχαινε μὴ ἔργα σιδήρε.

391 P. 67.

V. The Dr. n. 139. cites among the *Fragments incerti loci*, that known passage out of *Athenagoras*, Κεῖται δὲ ψευδῶς, &c. which Verses are no *Fragment*, but part of that *entire Poem*, *Hymnus in Jovem*.

W. This looks like cavilling. *Athenagoras* his *Reflection* upon *Callimachus* is not so vulgarly known, and for the sake of *that* alone did the Dr. I presume, produce this passage, πνεύον Καλλιμάχε δὲ γυναις, &c.

Besides these learned Observations of your own, and your many judicious Animadversions upon the mistakes of the Dr. * You have been pleased to present the *Learned World* with some farther Discoveries by way of *Supplement* to the former Editions of *Callimachus*. After my having been at such pains to disclose some of your Failures, 'twere Injustice to conceal your Improvements. But before I come to them, there is another part of your charge against the Dr. not immediately concerning Mr. Stanley's MS. upon which I am obliged to bestow some few Reflections.

Not content to have made the Dr. so *notorious a Plagiary* upon the account of Mr. Stanley's MS. you intermix here and there some *Proofs of Plagiarism* upon him from some other printed Books. 'Tis resolved, I see, the Dr. shall be a *Plagiary*.

Plagiary. The work is *begun* and it must be finished. If any of the same passages be to be found in any other Books whatsoever, whether printed or MS. as in the Dr. from thence shall the Dr. have *stole* them. According to which method I challenge you, Sir, to name that *modern* Writer, writing upon a Subject wherein the producing the *Authorities* of the *Ancients* is necessary, whom I shall not (even without the assistance of a Club, and with no more than one set of *fingers* to turn over Books) prove a *Plagiary*. And yet this is the way of these *Gentlemen* (I'll venture to put it in the Plural number) managing their Controversie with Dr. Bentley. But as for *you your self*, Sir (such is your reading) you are very sparing of your instances of this kind; and in these few you do produce as obliging to the Dr. as heart could wish.

In p. 72. *supr.* I took notice of about 9 or 10 pages in Dr. Bentley's Collection, small Letter and close Print, *sc.* from p. 327. to p. 337. for which only a little Marginal Reference in Mr. Stanley; the consideration of which I then *post-poned*, and shall here take it up. It is indeed at first sight the most plausible thing against the Dr. in the whole Indictment, and seems to make him directly beholden to Mr. Stanley for a little *hint* at least, though the working it out was left to himself. Were I at a loss for an answer here, our *Vindicator* (which, I P. 54, 55. thank him, he seldom fails to do) hath supplied me with one. But I need not crave his assistance. The case is this

In Mr. Stanley's MS. over-against the Title *Θαυμαστόν*, in the Margin, stands, *Meurs. in Antig.* c. CXLIV. That Chapter in *Antigonus* begins

begins thus. Πεποιήται δὲ τινα καὶ ὁ κυρηνᾶς Καλλιμαχὸς ἐκλογὴν τῶν εὐδοξίων ἢ ἀναγεσσομένων, ἃ ποτε ἡμῖν ἐφαίνετο εἶναι ἀκοῆς ἀξία; i. e. Callimachus of Cyrene hath made a Collection of things strange and wonderfull, the most remarkable of which I shall transcribe. And so he begins his transcribing, Φησὶν Εὐδοξὸν ἰσορρεῖν ὅτι, &c. He (Callimachus) saith, that Eudoxus relates that, &c.

Now upon this Mr. Stanley had made this Remark. *Quibus ex verbis omnia quæ sequuntur usque ad finem libri ex Callimacho deprompta esse conjicere licet; i. e. From which words one may conjecture that all that follows in Antigonus to the end of the Book is taken from Callimachus.* And good reason had he so to conjecture; for Antigonus in his cap. 144. entering upon transcribing from Callimachus, and it not appearing (his Book being imperfect) where he ended, the inference is very fair, that all that follows in that Book, as it now stands imperfect, is taken from Callimachus. An instance of the same kind we have before in the same Book, Antig. c. 32. Καὶ μὴν τὰς τελοῦσας ἐντεχνίας τῶν ζώων—ἀκρεβέστατ' ἂν τις ἐκ τῆς τῆς Ἀειστούλης συναγωγῆς καταμάσδοι, ὅς τις ἡμεῖς πρῶτον ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἐκλογὴν, cap. 33. φησὶ περὶ κωνόπ. &c. i. e. The several other wonderfull Sagacities of certain Animals one may find most accurately described in the writings of Aristotle, out of which, before I go any further, I shall make this following Collection. cap. 33. He saith that the Wolves about the Lake of, &c. And so he goes on still transcribing out of Aristotle to cap. 127. which he thus concludes, Πολλῶν δ' ὄντων ὧν καταλέγεσθαι Ἀειστούλης, &c. i. e. But Aristotle hath left behind him many Books

Books, out of which, what I have here given is all that I could at present recollect. And so he breaks off his transcribing out of Aristotle. After the same manner doth he begin his Collection out of Callimachus, c. 144. But where he ended, his Book being imperfect, we know not. Therefore saith, Dr. Bentley, p. 328. & *profecto ut omnia, quæ deinceps, &c.* As all that is in Antigonus from, cap. 32. to cap. 127. is transcribed from Aristotle, so all from cap. 144. to the end of the Book is taken from Callimachus. And accordingly all those passages he transfers into his Collection. Upon which our Vindicator cries out shame upon him. I cannot acquit him, saith he, either of being vain-glorious, or a Plagiary, when he avers (as 'tis true he doth) that he himself was the first who restored those noble Fragments to their true Author. For how can Dr. Bentley have the face to say, that he was the first, when Mr. Stanley had observed it before him. But had Mr. Stanley also observed the like of Aristotle? But to let that drop. Pray, Sir, will you please to read your own words immediately following your Transcription out of Mr. Stanley. *Quibus ex verbis &c.* And with Mr. Stanley agrees the Learned John- P. 55.
sius in his second Book of the Writers of Philosophick History, cap. 12. p. 176. If therefore Johnsius had observed it as well as Mr. Stanley, then Mr. Stanley was neither the first man nor the only man that had observed it. And why may not our Learned Critick (a Title, which, P. 61.
 since some Books lately 'publish'd against him, no man will deny to Dr. Bentley) have observed it without the help of Mr. Stanley's MS. as well as had the Learned Johnsius, whose right to the
 same

- P. 55. same *Title* is as little disputed? But in the words immediately following, and in several other places of your Book, you tell us over and over, and that very *emphatically*, that the Dr. had thorowly read that piece of *Johnsius*. You have over-done your work, Sir, and *laid the*
- P. 61. & *segg.* Mr. B. p. *Indictment in two places.* The unhappiest man at managing an Accusation, that ever took such a piece of work in hand. Pray, Sir, will you please to certify the world in your *third* Edition, from whom did the Dr. take this *hint* first? Did he take it from *Johnsius* first, and afterwards from Mr. *Stanley*? or first from Mr. *Stanley*, and afterward from *Johnsius*? This, Sir, is a point upon which you ought to be very *determinate*, the Province you have taken upon you obligeth you to restore every Paragraph to its right Author. And therefore you must let the world know precisely, if Dr. *Bentley's* name must be expunged, whose name must be put in the room of it in the next *Impression* of *Callimachus*: whether Mr. *Stanley's* or the Learned *Johnsius*. For without a more particular information than you have yet given, Mr. *Gravius* will not be able to do justice between them.
- P. 76.
- P. 74.

But I'll maintain the Dr's right. His name must not be expunged out of the next *Impression*. I very confidently presume the Discovery was of the Dr's own making, and (not to flatter him) 'tis one of the meanest in his whole Book. *Antigonus* himself had laid it so full in view, that no body, reading him with attention, especially having that *Greek Poet, Callimachus* in his thoughts, could have pass'd it over/unnobserved. Let the Reader cast his eyes back upon the

the *πρωίμα δὲ τινος* — and the *φασιν*. *Callimachus made a certain Collection* — He saith that — Now, Sir, dip upon what Chapter you will in *Antigonus* after c. 144. to the end of his Book, (abating here and there an *Interfection* of the Collectors own, easie enough to be distinguish'd from the rest) you will find this *φασιν* either express or *subintellect* before the Infinitive Mood: for the Dr's Correction of *Θεόρεσσεν* into *Θεόρεσεν*, c. 145, and of *ισορεῖ* into *ισορεῖν*, c. 147. with others of the like kind, I suppose no body (unless perhaps your self) will dispute with him: And that *φασιν* must have some *Nominative Case*, and that *Nominative Case* can be no other than *Καλλίμαχος*. So that the utmost of the Dr's Discovery here was only finding out first the *principal Verb*, and the then *Nominative Case* to it: which 'tis a strange thing if he could not have done without the help of your MS.

But why then is the Dr. so *vain glorious* up. P. 54. on his performance here if it was so easie a thing? *Hand mase, opinor, de Callimacho meritis sum, qui primus tam luculenta ἀποσπασμάτια illi restituo.* I think *Callimachus is not a little obliged to me for being the first who restore to him so fair a quantity of Fragments.*

Because the thing is true. For how obvious soever the Discovery might lie, yet no body having before given the Publick any notice of it, (no not, in express terms, *Johnsus* himself) or taken care to restore these Fragments to their true Author: to the Dr. alone doth *Callimachus* owe his *Obligations*. Besides which, *Callimachus* is not a little obliged to the Dr. for the commendable pains you your self acknowledge *Ibid.* him to have bestow'd upon these Fragments:

For

For his having restor'd them to their genuine *Lectiō*, and for his having justified our *Poet's* Narrations from the concurring Testimonies of so many other good Authorities. And if you will please to look over the many improvements which (after the learned and accurate *Meursius* and *Xylander*) the Dr. hath made upon that part of *Antigonus*, you will find that he might well think *Callimachus* not a little obliged to him, and that I spake within compass when I said before, bringing this very instance for a proof of it, that in many places for one single line which you alledge against the Dr. as stoln from Mr. *Stanley*, the Dr's Additions are more than twenty to one. As in this present case is very manifest, taking in your *marginal Reference* in its utmost extent.

Sap. p. 33. Ay, that's true indeed, *in this place*. But to whom is the Dr. obliged for all this? To the learned *Johnsius*, who advised his Reader to consult *Stephanus*, *Pliny*, and *Suidas*. And 'tis plain by the comparison, that Dr. Bentley follow'd his Advice, though he will not own his kindness.

P. 55.

As much as to say; That Dr. Bentley would never have read *Stephanus*, *Pliny*, and *Suidas*, had not the Learned *Johnsius* put him in mind of it, that there were such Books in the world, and that he ought to read them. For this Advice and Advertisement is it that the Dr. is so deeply obliged to the Learned *Johnsius*, and (ungratefull man as he is) hath not told the world who told him of those Books.

'Tis plain, by the comparison, you say, that the Dr. follow'd his Advice. That is, To a man that will read over the Dr's Collection it will plainly

plainly appear, that the Dr. hath read *Stephanus*, *Suidas* and *Pliny*. As for *Stephanus* and *Suidas* we have had enough of them already. *Supr. p. 39*, But hath the Dr. read *Pliny* too? Yes, 'tis 54: 55: plain, you say, *be bath*. Now, pray, Sir, turn to the 83d page of your Book, and there you do as good as say the Dr. hath not read *Pliny*. For the Dr. having produced several passages out of *Pliny*, as n. 392, 393, 394, &c. *Harduin's Indices*, say you, directed Dr. Bentley to these Quotations out of *Pliny*, q. d. Dr. Bentley did not meet with these Quotations in *Pliny* himself, but just turned to the *Index Authorum*, v. *Callimachus*, and so came by them. But if the Dr. follow'd *Johnsus's* Advice, and turned over *Pliny* himself, as 'tis plain he did; what need was there of running to *Harduin's Indices*? 'Tis a plain case, Sir, from the beginning of your Book to the end of it; that you know not, or matter not what you say, so that you can but sling out somewhat against the Dr. And this is the way of all of you. *Calumniare fortiter*, is the rule you go by. But there should be a little wit in it. I wonder how your Book comes to bear a second Edition. In p. 65. I find you upon *Harduin* and *Pliny* again. His Quotation out of the *Scholiast* upon *Apollonius Harduin* in his Notes upon *Pliny* supply'd him with. Ridiculous! as if the *Scholiast* upon *Apollonius* himself were not sooner read over than a *Pliny* with *Harduin's* Notes, or as if that were the only Quotation out of the *Scholiast* upon *Apollonius* in the Dr's Collection. But *Vid. supr. p. 35.* that Quotation is not in *Harduin's Index*. So that all that is in *Harduin's Index*, from the *Index* the Dr. stole it: but what is not the *Index*, for

for that he is oblig'd to *Johnsus*, who advis'd him to read over *Pliny* himself, which Advice, 'tis plain, the Dr. followed. Are you not ashamed, Sir, of putting such stuff as this into print? I do not answer these things, as if they deserved an Answer, but to let the world see how these men manage their Controversie against Dr. Bentley. The Dr. must have what is in the *Index*, or not have what is in the Author, *vid. supr. p. 55.*

But you are a person as unlucky in your *Memorandum's*, as you are inconsistent in your Allegations. Let me lay down this as a rule: 'tis not for a young Writer to despise an *Index*. 'Tis but comparing the Author of Dr. Bentley's Dissertation upon the Epistles of *Rhalaris* examined, p. 164. with Dr. Bentley's Answer, p. 229. And with the *Index* to a very common Book, *Ælian. Var. Hist. literâ x.* and you'll find out my meaning.

P. 57.

V. The Quotation out of the Learned *Scholiast* upon *Aristophanes*, n. 101. was ready brought to his hands by the Editor of *Aristænetus* his Epistles, ep. 10. p. 229.

W. I had reason to observe of you, that you are the most unhappy man to your Friends, and the most obliging to your Adversary that ever took Pen in hand.

The Dr. stole his Quotation out of the *Scholiast* upon *Aristophanes* from the Editor of *Aristænetus* his Epistles.

Ans. 1. Compare your Learned Patron, p. 31. Marg. with Dr. B. Answer, p. 21. and Mr. B's p. 164. again with Dr. B's Answer, p. 229, 230. and you will find that the Dr. was too well acquainted with the *Scholiast* upon *Ari-*

Aristophanes, to have borrowed his Quotation out of that *Scholiast* from the *Editor* of *Aristanetus*.

2. The Dr. in this very place rectifies a mistake of that Learned *Scholiast*, which the Learned *Editor* of *Aristanetus* transcribes into his Annotations without taking any notice of it. So that you have here marked out an instance for the Reader to reflect upon: That the Dr. how notorious a Plagiary soever, yet he is none of your *Pedantious Criticks*, a *literatim* Transcriber of other mens Mistakes, and making them his own. The Dr. is able to correct the faulty *Opinions* of the Ancients, as well as the faulty *Copies* of their Works.

3. The Dr. also rectifies a little mistake of that Learned *Editor* of *Aristanetus* (*Josias Mercerus*, Sir, the Father-in-Law to *Salmasius*) who misquotes this piece of *Callimachus* under the Title of *Aiontius*, whereas it should have been *Κυδίππην*; as the Dr. from the Authority of *Ovid* establishes it. And that I put the Reader in mind of this other second little advantage, which (as to this particular) Dr. *Bentley* hath over the Learned *Mercerus*, is owing to your self, who were so friendly to the Dr. as to point it out to me.

4. You have supply'd the Dr. with a fresh Authority here for that new *Lectio* which he gives of this *Fragment*, and justified his Correction of the Learned *Scholiast* upon *Aristophanes*. The *Fragment* it self is this.

Ἄλλ' ἐνὶ δὴ φλοιοῖσι κακόμενα τέσσα φορεῖτε

Γεγμματα, Κυδίππην δ' ὡς ἔρεσκε καλὴν.

In the *Scholiast* upon *Aristophanes*, for φλοιοῖσι it stands φύλλοισι: and as that *Lectio* is admitted by

by him for genuine; so from him in the same words is it transcribed by the Learned *Mercerus*: and otherwise than with that *Lectio* I presume it is no where to be found, nor was there ever, perhaps, before the Dr. any suspicion entertain'd concerning it. But the Dr. than whom ('tis plain by the comparison) no man reads Books more intently, discovered some thing of incongruity in this *Lectio* φύλλοις, and therefore ventures, by a conjectural Emendation, to restore it φλοιόις. And was at some pains to justify the Correction both from *Reason* and *Authority*: but the most proper *Authority* in the world to his purpose he had (I know not how) omitted. In comes our most obliging *Vindicator* here, and supplies him with it. Nor could one that had studied for it, have given a fuller demonstration of the Dr's happiness at a *Conjecture*, than hath this very man, who is writing a Book against him; having pointed out to us the very place which establishes beyond controul every thing the Dr. hath said, *Aristænet. ep. 10. (m. p. 46, 49.)* εἴθε ὃ δένδεα, &c. ἢ γὰρ ποῦτα καὶ τῶν φλοιῶν ἐγκακολάμμενα φέροιτε γράμματα ὅσα τὴν Κυδίππην ἐπονομάζει καλὴν, π. β. καὶ τῶν φλοιῶν, not φύλλων, words coming as near to those of the *Fragment* according to the Dr's Correction of it, as Prose and Verse would fairly admit. Sir, the Dr. is obliged to you, and (in his name) I presume to return you Thanks. This Discovery (the very best in your whole Book, though made without your knowing any thing of it) will, I doubt not, be inserted in the next Impression of *Callimachus*. And therefore,

5. From hence I infer a *Negative* directly contradictory to your *Affirmative*, viz. The Dr. did *not* take his Quotation out of the *Schooliaſt* upon *Ariſtophanes* from the *Editor* of *Ariſtænetus*. For if the Dr. had then had *Ariſtænetus* in his view, he would not have omitted an *Authority* ſo direct to his purpoſe. You *may* cavil; but the Inference is *undeniable*.

I have drawn out my Answer to this your Allegation into ſo many particulars, to ſhew you, *firſt*, How imprudently you have acted in putting one ſo often in mind of things which were better forgotten: though indeed let the beſt Pen that can be found engage any farther in this Cauſe, it will be next to impoſſible to eſcape ſplitting upon the ſame Rock. And *ſecondly*, to let you ſee how much it turns to the Dr's advantage to have his writings brought under a cloſe Examination.

V. The greateſt and beſt part of thoſe numerous Quotations which adorn Dr. Bentley's Edition under the ſeveral *Nixæ*, p. 351. & ſeq. were before collected by *Johnſius*.

W. At which leaſt the Reader ſhould be ſurprized, you ſpend no leſs than three pages to ſhew with *what Judgment and Accuracy that* *Learned Perſon hath treated of theſe Catalogues, Indices, or Tables of Callimachus*. So that all that you prove here is, that he muſt be a very extraordinary man indeed, who can ſo exhaust his Subject as that Dr. Bentley coming after him ſhall not find room for improvements. And if you could have ſaid not only the *greateſt and beſt part*, but all and every one of the Quotations in the Dr's Collection were before drawn together by *Johnſius*, yet even ſo it would have amounted

amounted to no more than this; That two very Learned Persons treating upon the same point of Antiquity, neither of them had made any material Omissions. If you had known how to have managed your cause, you should have spared your elaborate Elogies upon *Johnsius*, with which you have but made a Garland for Dr. Bentley. Like the Monarch, who spent the greatest part of a long Reign in gathering Trophies onely to place them all at last upon his Neighbour's head.

P. 55, 61,
 &c.

But you will not part with *Johnsius* so. If you can have read me hitherto without a Blush, prepare for one now.

P. 64.

V. Dr. Bentley to **conceal** his *transferring* *Johnsius's* Correction of *antimachus* for *Callimachus* into his own Stores, cites the passage (n. 390.) out of *Eusebius*, whereas in the Edition of *Tatianus*, from whom *Eusebius* had it, the names are as they ought to be read.

P. 19, 25,
 76.

W. Good Reader, look over these words again; Dr. Bentley to **conceal**, &c. Here doth this Man, who quotes Scripture and Councils, charge Dr. Bentley with having stole a Correction from *Johnsius*, and with using a certain Artifice to *conceal* the *Fraud*. Every Syllable of which is as wilfull a falshood as words can express. Turn to the Dr's n. 390. p. 423. *Tatianus apud Eusebium, Præp. Evang. lib. 10. Περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ πῦρ Οὐρανός, &c.* After the Quotation given at large the Dr hath these words. *Ex hoc loco Vossius in libello posthumo de Poetis laudat Callimachum Colophonium: sed lege apud Eusebium Ἀντίμαχος ὁ Κολοφώνιος. Ut recte habetur apud ipsum Tatianum, sed hoc video doctissimum JOHNSIUM ante me animadvertisse.* 'Tis true the Dr. transcribes

scribes the passage out of *Eusebius*, but he tells us how it stands in *Tatianus*. The reason of his transcribing it out of *Eusebius*, was, I presume, to take this opportunity of giving the Reader notice of a false *Lectio* crept into the Copies of that Author, and of a mistake from thence transferred into *Vossius* his posthumous Piece *de Poetis*. No, saith the *Vindicator*: he did it on purpose to conceal his having stole this Correction from *Johnsius*. Oh Confidence! Construe it, Sir. *Sed hoc video doctissimum JOHN- SIUM ante me animadvertisse*. To conceal! as plain as Pen can put down words on Paper, 'tis declar'd that the Learned *Johnsius* had made that Correction before him. Here are your Writers against Dr. Bentley! And will you still believe them, Reader? But take another instance.

V. The Corrections of the Fragment, *n. 233*, P. 71, 72. were ready made to the Dr's hand by *Salinasius*, and in *Is. Vossius* his MS. The old Translator of *Pollux* had given the true rendering of *εὐ πλάττω*. *Pluto Aristophanes*: which Dr. Bentley calls his own.

W. Confidently! Dr. Bentley doth not call the true rendering *εὐ πλάττω* his own. So far is the Dr from claiming to himself the Corrections ready made to his hands by others, that in express terms he disclaims them. The Dr's words are these: *Qui quidem locus, in vulgatis codicibus mendosissimus, recte ita emendatus est a viris eruditiss.* — *Et ita sane Codex qui fuit in aed. Vossii*. Is this calling things his own? 'Twere Charity to believe you cannot construe Latin. But the rectifying the mistakes of the Scholiast, and the correcting the Text of *Ari-*

Stophanes himself: a Correction just and necessary, and which perhaps was never so much as aimed at before the Dr. and without which, neither could the *Poet*, nor his *Commentator*, nor *J. Pollux* have been understood; This the Dr. doth call his *own*, and his *own* it is, *vid. loc. Fragm. n. 233. p. 395.*

P. 85.

V. *Salvagnius Boessius* in his *Prolegomena* to his *Commentary* upon *Ovid's Ibis*, hath inserted the Epigram out of the *Anthology* (which Dr. *Bentley* has transcribed *num. 2.*) with the Emendation of *Καλλιμαχ* & for *Καλλιμάχ* (claimed as his *own* by the Dr.) though he confesses that the admirable Critick *Eustathius* reads it *Καλλιμάχ*.

W. Of all this I do not understand one word. The Emendation of *Καλλιμάχ* into *Καλλιμαχ* & the Dr. doth (both here *Fragm. n. 2.* and *Ep. ad fin. Mælel. p. 71.*) claim as his *own*, and his *own* I believe it is. In *Salvagnius Boessius's Prolegomena* I find not a Syllable of that Epigram either with an Emendation or without. Who confesses, that the admirable Critick *Eustathius* reads it *Καλλιμαχ* & ? *Salvagnius* or Dr. *Bentley* ? in neither of them do I find the least mention of *Eustathius* relating to this matter. My *Salvagnius Boessius* is 8vo. *Lugd. 1661.* There may be some later Edition for ought I know, in which may be the passages you speak of: but I have never seen any such Edition, nor (as I have a reason, not worth the telling, to believe) hath Dr. *Bentley*. So that how many soever Editions of *Salvagnius Boessius* there may be, what Dr. *Bentley* here calls his *own* is still his *own*.

V. In those *Prolegomena* also is to be found the Epigram of *Martial* upon the *Aitia*.

W. In *Dacier's Testimonia veterum* also is to be found the Epigram of *Martial* upon the *Aitia*; and in *Farnaby's Martial* also is to be found the Epigram of *Martial* upon the *Aitia*. Stuff!

V. In *Salvagnius Boessius* his Commentary upon *Ovid's Ibis* are many other good Observations, which *Dr. Bentley* hath read.

W. 'Tis more than natural Stupidity: it looks like a kind of *Infatuation*, that a man should be so constant in confuting himself. Compare, Sir, these two pages of yours; page 35. with page 85.

Page 35. The Epigram out of *Martial* (n. 2.) is in *Mr. Stanley's* Collection.

Page 85. The Epigram out of *Martial* (n. 2.) is in *Salvagnius Boessius* (m. p. 48.) And *Salvagnius Boessius* *Dr. Bentley* hath read.

Page 35. The Quotation out of *Clemens Alexandrinus* (n. 2.) is in *Mr. Stanley's* Collection.

Page 85. But *Salvagnius Boessius* *Dr. Bentley* hath read: and in *Salvagnius Boessius* is that Quotation out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *verbatim*, p. 47.

Page. 35. The Quotation out. of *Servius* upon *Virgil*, n. 8. is transcribed from *Mr. Stanley*, *verbatim*. Supr. p. 62.

Page 85. *Salvagnius Boessius* his Commentary upon *Ovid's Ibis* *Dr. Bentley* hath read: and in that Commentary, p. 301. is that Quotation out of *Servius* upon *Virgil*.

How will you look your Honourable Patron in the face, after having thus discover'd to him how

how carelessly you read his Book, and how little you minded the caution he gave you, Not Mr. B. p. to lay your *Indictment* in two places.

142.

Supr. p. 66

And this is what I before promised you to take some particular notice of. Read what is there (p. 63, 64.) written upon that Quotation out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 'Ευποείων δ', &c. I here repeat my charge against you, Sir, and in the plain unaffected *Stile* I call you false Accuser, and prepensely such. You knew these several passages to be in *Salvagnius Boessius*; *Salvagnius Boessius* you knew the Dr. to have read: how then durst you charge these particular passages upon him as *Proofs* of his *Plagiarism* from Mr. Stanley's MS. all of which you knew the Dr. to have met with elsewhere; and one of which you knew, you could not but know, your own Eye sight assured you, that the Dr. did actually transcribe, not from Mr. Stanley, but from *Salvagnius Boessius*? I say, which you could not but know, that the Dr. did not take from Mr. Stanley. For that Quotation out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, as it is given us in the Dr's Collection, I am very confident is not now (whatsoever it may be e'er long) in Mr. Stanley's MS. nor, I believe in any other printed Book whatever save in *Salvagnius Boessius*; and therefore only from him can the Dr. have transcribed it. And this you cannot have been ignorant of, since both *Salvagnius Boessius*, and Dr. Bentley himself have given express notice of it: *Salvagnius*, p. 47. Sic & *Clemens Alexandrinus*, lib. 5. Strom. 'Ευποείων δ' ὁ ποιητής, &c. Sic enim Manuscriptus meus pervetustus Codex cum in omnibus Editionibus desint hæc verba ὁ ἢ ΚΑΛΙΝΟΥΧΟΣ ΙΒΙΣ; and in Dr. Bentley, p. 345.

Tit.

Tit. IBIS ita Codex MStus Dionysii Salvagnii: in vulgatis IBIS abest. I do therefore again and again repeat it upon you, Sir, though your whole Book be a Proof of it, yet more especially from this particular passage, as being an irrefragable Demonstration; that you are a *false Accuser*, and that you are *prepensely* such. First, In telling the World, *that that is* in your MS. which is *not* in your MS. and secondly, in placing among your *Proofs* of things transcribed from your MS. that which you *knew* was *not* transcribed from your MS. and upon both these Articles I bring in your own *Salvagnius Boessius* for *Evidence* against you. And this you have gotten by over-doing your work, and *laying your Indictment in two places*. And the Man once *convicted* of *wilfull*, I cannot say *Perjury*, because 'tis not in a Court of Record, though you have kiss'd the Bible upon it more than once; yet of *wilfull Prevarication* is become for ever afterwards (at least, as to that cause) an incompetent Witness. And how far this Sentence may extend, I leave it to those who are most concerned in it to consider: desiring them withal, out of pure Compassion to themselves, not to be over eager in tempting a no very unwilling man to discover all he knows. For the letting the world know, how far *Bussie* men are to be credited, I take to be doing a good piece of Service to the Publick; which he that shall venture upon, as he must incur the Displeasure of Many, so he deserves the Thanks of more than One. I have complied (and not many more so obedient Readers can he boast of) with Mr. B's *unreasonable Request*, with which he concludes his Preface to his *Examination* of

Dr. Bentley. But as for you your self, Sir, I have now near upon the matter done with you. For as for your wretched *common-place* Rallery, and your blunt *Characterisins* upon the Dr. (most of them stole from your Honourable Patron, but spoil'd in the telling) I scorn to take any notice of them. But there is still behind your

SUPPLEMENT.

And that *Supplement* of yours must not be pass'd over in silence. Then might you call me a *partial* Writer indeed, if I took no notice of your *Supplement*. This *Supplement* of yours you have set forth in a place by it self; and, the more effectually to draw the Reader's Eye upon it, marked it out into XIII Capital Figures. You introduce it thus.

V. I expected, when I look'd on the last beautifull Edition of *Callimachus*, to have found every little passage of the Ancient Writers, wherein but his Name was mention'd, gather'd to my hands by Dr. Bentley.

W. Then you could not but have expected to have found in Dr. Bentley all those Quotations out of the *Ancient Writers* which are in Mr. Stanley's MS. whether ever he had seen that MS. or not. 'Tis Fate; The Dr. *shall* be acquitted by the same Mouth that accuses him.

V. But I have met with a few, which, I presume he either had not seen or forgotten.

W. A few.

V. And because I am perswaded it will not *differve* the Learned World, I shall insert them.

W. Sc.

W. Sc. By way of Supplement to the former Editions of *Callimachus*. For otherwise, what service could it be to the Learned World? And so you explain your self when upon *Num. XII.* you expressly say (p. 49.) that that Epigram, *Quenam hæc forma Dei, &c.* was (you thought) omitted in the late Edition. Here therefore we may expect to see the whole extent of your Reading, and what Services the Learned World may promise it self from your Pen. I shall take them one by one in order as they lie.

Num. I. *Suidas* v. *Κωλιάς*, Ναός ὅτι τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, &c. formerly cited at length, p. 42, 43.

W. *Supra*, p. 38.

V. *Num. II.* v. *Κωμῆται*. *Κωμῆται* ἔοι γέγονες, &c. in the same page.

W. In the same page.

V. *Κάππα* Mr. B. p. 245:

W. *Κάππα supra*, p. 39.

V. *Num. III.* *Natalis Comes*'s his Citation out of *Callimachus*'s *Hecate*, accounted for already, p. 44.

W. I'll have nothing to do with *Natalis Comes*.

But why should I be so angry, will you ask me, with *Natalis Comes*? That *Italian Critick* p. 50, 51. was a famous man in his Generation, and had read no body knows how many MSS. P. 45.

I'll tell you, Sir, There was a certain *Italian Critick*, a man of vast Learning indeed, but V. Mr. B. withal so horrible unmannerly, that the world ha- p. 225. con- sidered and despised him at the same time that it was fer. cum profiting by him; one *Joseph Scaliger*. And he Dr. B's Answ. hath given me such an Idea of this *Italian Cri- Pref. p. 100.* tick of yours, that makes me apt (at first sight) to think the worse of any Book (yours I except) wherein

Scaliger.
Ep. 309.

wherein I do but meet with so much as the name of this *Natalis Comes*. 'Tis in one of his Letters to *Sethus Calvisius*, where he tells that great *Astronomer* with what satisfaction all men of Learning received that excellent Book; his *Chronology*. Upon which he immediately adds; *Qui unum, ac cum illis ego, à te petuno, ut scriptorum quorundam minorum gentium mentione, qualis est Natalis Comes, homo futilissimus, abstineas. Delet enim magnis viris illos pannos tua purpura assui: Tu hæc in secundâ editione turabis.* That it grieved all men of Learning to see the name of so wretched a Trifler as *Natalis Comes* standing in so excellent a Book as *Calvisius* his *Chronology*, and therefore *Scaliger* begs of him, that in the next Edition he would strike him out; which accordingly was done. This passage of *Scaliger*, *Mausacius* in his *Dissert. Critic.* (referr'd to more than once before) repeats, and expresses himself even to a passion upon it. It raised an indignation in him, that there should be found men in the world so weak as to pretend to establish any thing upon the Credit of such beggarly Scriblers as *Natalis Comes*, and set up for *Criticks* and *Authors* by stuffing out their Books with such borrow'd *Authorities*. So that whether the Dr. had never seen this passage in *Natalis Comes*, or whether he had forgotten it, or whether (which is more likely) he neglected it, I am not able to determine: But that this *Natalis Comes* is an Author with whom you are extremely well acquainted, is a plain case. There's not any one Name in your whole Book come so often over as *Natalis Comes*. Doctor *Bentley* takes his Fragment, n. 110. from the
Ep.

Etymologicon (*Nicas* some call him — turn to P. 43, 44. it, Reader, in the *Vindicator's* Book, p. 43, 44. 'Tis a Learned Parenthesis) but *Natalis Comes* had published a larger Fragment: Dr. Bentley takes after *Casaubon's* Lesson; but *Natalis Comes* gives them more correct, and translates them better: and who knows what MSS. *Natalis Comes* may have seen? *Natalis Comes* gives another Epigram too as from *Callimachus*, and though I know not, whether that Italian Author was Critick enough to determine the Controversie; [what Controversie?] yet Dr. Bentley might have been so fair, as to have mention'd him. *Natalis Comes* hath given us a handsome Commentary upon the Fragment, num. 209. int. *Bentleian*. But Dr. Bentley transcribes it (and that but abruptly) from the *Scholiast* upon *Sophocles*: and that Book indeed, the *Scholiast* upon *Sophocles* the Dr. had consulted: but as for *Natalis Comes*, one knows not whether Dr. Bentley hath ever so much as seen that Italian Critick. And here again, Num. III. we have *Natalis Comes*: and Num. XI. *Natalis Comes* again. And may Mr. B. p. not a man say of this *Natalis*, your Darling 26. confer. Author: This *Natalis Comes*, Sir, is an er- cum Dr. ranter Pedant than *Dion Chrysostom* himself. B's Answ. p. 5, 6.

But,

Pro captu Lectoris habent sua fata libelli.

The sense of which words I find happily alluded to in a late excellent Poem.

But each vile Scribler's happy on this Score, Dispensary.
He'll find some Draucus still to read him o'er.

After *Natalis Comes* your next darling Author is *Lactantius Placidus*. In page 36. we have had *Lactantius*, or (as you well observe) *Lutatius Placidus*; in pag. 38, 39. You have run on

on score with the same *Lactantius Placidus* for a considerable parcel of mistakes of the first size. *Supr. p. 93.* Here *n. IV.* you are in with your *Lactantius* again, and *n. IX* you will even Account with him, making as many mistakes, and as foul ones upon *Lactantius*, as *Lactantius* had before made for you.

V. *N. IV. Lactantius Placidus, &c.*

W. Enjoy it. The other three you are beholden to your MS. for. For though I doubt not, but that Mr. Stanley had read all *Suidas* over, yet for Mr. Stanley's Vindicator I cannot make out the like Evidence. *Lactantius Placidus* is a Critick so stooping towards your hight, that I am apt to believe you may have read him. And therefore this Number IV. (though I think I could dispossess you of it) yet I am willing to let pass for your own.

But here (as you cannot forbear him) you occasionally bring in another Remark upon the Dr. which should indeed have been referr'd to the *Class of Transportations, supr. p. 78.*

P. 82.

V. To that Book of *Callimachus*, entitled, *Κτίσις Νήσων καὶ πόλεων, καὶ μετωνομασίαι*; that is, *The foundation of Cities and Islands, and the change of their Names*; I would also refer all those passages in *Pliny*, cited by Dr. Bentley, *n. 392, 393, 394, 395, 397.* in which there is an *express mention* of the change of the names of those places.

W. In not one of these passages out of *Pliny* is there any such *express mention*. There is indeed *express mention* of the Names of several Places and People, and sometimes of several Names of the same places: but not of the *μετωνομασίαι*, the *Change* of those Names. That which

which comes the nearest to your purpose, is n. 397. *Eam (Samothracen) Callimachus antiquo nomine Dardaniam vocat.* But to have answer'd your design, it should have been, *antiqua nomine.* (or rather *antiquitus*) *Dardaniam vocatam (fuisse) tradit.* Express mention, you say, of the change of those Names. But, pray, Sir, what express mention of the change of the Names do you find in this Fragment, n. 393. *inter Corcyram & Illyricum Melita; unde Catulos Melitaos appellari Callimachus Auctor est.* Here is, you say, express mention of the change of the Names. Were the *Melitæi* therefore formerly called *Catuli*, or the *Catuli*, *Melitæi*? For the one or the other of these you must mean. There were, Sir, of old a certain Race of *Lap-dogs* called *Catuli Melitæi*; and this name, saith *Callimachus*, was given them from the Island *Melita*; that is, from this Island *Melita* lying near *Coreyra* (*Corfu*;) not that other Island of the same name lying near *Sicily*, now called *Malta*. And this is all that *Pliny* means. But by one dash of your Pen are an whole Nation of Islanders *metamorphos'd* into a breed of *Lap-dogs*. A man that was minded to deal less tenderly with you, than I am, would not have parted with this choice piece of *Lap-dog Criticism* for two or three pages together. But I cannot imagin you to be so wretchedly ignorant, as to have taken the *Catuli Melitæi* for a People. Mr. B. p. No, certainly, Sir, you are a greater Scholar 45. than so. This was put down only to carry on the humour of contradicting Dr. Bentley. But as you have got nothing by it hitherto, let me advise you to give it over.

P. 83.

V. I am of opinion that the Fragment *num.* 399. may belong to *Callimachus* the Statuary.

W. Here you are at it again; Dr. Bentley must be corrected. There can no other reason in the world be given for any man's being of that opinion, but because that Fragment relates to a *Statue*. *Pliny* tells us a story of a certain person, that had, during his life-time two *Statues*, erected to him, both of which *Statues*, though standing in places far distant the one from the other (the one in *Italy*, the other in *Greece*) were struck with *Lightning* on the same day. This, saith *Pliny*, *Callimachus* took'd upon as next to a *Prodigy*. And might not *Callimachus* the *Poet* wonder at so strange an Accident as well as *Callimachus* the *Statuary*? But however this serves to expose the Dr. who (with *Hardin*) was so injudicious as to refer this passage to *Callimachus* the *Poet*.

V. *Num. V.* A Quotation out of *Diomedes Grammaticus*.

Num. VI. The like out of *Atil. Fortunatianus de Priapeio metro*.

W. The only *Discovery* with which you have in these two Numbers obliged the *Learned World* is, that as among the *Romans*, *Propertius*, *Tibullus*, and *Gallus* wrote in *Elegiac Verse*: So before them did *Callimachus* and *Euphorion* among the *Greeks*. And that *Callimachus* in his *Epigrams* had, as to the choice of his *Metre*, some *Peculiarities* of his own (tis not said what) as had also *Bacchilides*, and some other *Poets*, theirs. And this is one of those *Discoveries omitted by Dr. Bentley*; the bringing of which to light, you are persuaded is no *Dis-service* to the *Learned World*. Certainly so,

Sir,

P. 49.

Sir, no *Disservice*. Your Quotation of *Atil. Fortunatianus* is out of *Putsebius* his *Grammatici Veteres*, p. 2676. In the Dr's Answer to your Honourable Patron, p. 227. I find him within three pages of you in the same *Atil. Fortunatianus*, sc. on p. 2679. *de Saturnio versu*. Which passage in the Dr. with the occasion of his producing it, (p. 226.) I recommend to the perusal of the inquisitive Reader. Soilbeck are you all along in your *Memorandums*, though I take notice of but few of them.

V. Num. VII. *Atilius Fortunatianus*, p. 2680. *de Saturnio versu*.

W. Much to the same purpose as the two former, only with this difference; That as in them you did no *Disservice* to the Learned World, so in this you do no *Servic*; this very passage being printed in *Grævius's Callimachus*, and placed by *Spanheim*, where it should be, amongst the *Testimonia*; p. 202.

V. Num. VIII. A Quotation out of *Cæcilius Minutianus Apuleius* from *Cælius Rhodiginus*.

W. In the fore-mention'd *Salvagnius Boessius* his *Prolegomena*, p. 16. which our Vindicator, without naming his Benefactor, hath confidently made his own. But those *Prolegomena* of *Salvagnius Boessius* Dr. Bentley hath read, and *Supr. p.* therefore cannot but have seen this Quotation. 'Tis a known Story, and produced by the Dr. over and over, (p. 245.) and that from far more certain Authorities, than that unknown *Cæcil. Minutianus Apuleius*, upon whom *Salvagnius* sets this mark; *Qui nondum lucem vidit, unique Cælio Rhodigino notus fuit.*

V. Num.

V. Num. IX. *Lactantius Placidus.*

Your darling Author *Lactantius Placidus*. There was no occasion in the world for your *exposing* your self here. In the first place you do not *contradict* Dr. Bentley. In the next, when you were only making a *Supplement* to *Callimachus*, you should have let those things alone which were already done to your hand. The passage here produced is printed with a large *Commentary* upon it, by *Spanheim* in his Volume of *Learned Observations* upon this Author, p. 571, 572. And a little *Modesty* might have taught you not to have medled with a subject before exhausted by so masterly a Pen. But to do you Justice, I verily believe, you did not *know* of Mr. *Spanheim's* having said any thing to it.

P. 86.

V. Were I allow'd to play the *bold Critick*, I would for *Arcados* read *Argivi*, (for *Tydeus*, the Father of *Diomedes*——).

Supr. p. 92,
93.

W. *Bold Critick*! Most properly spoken, and since 'tis an *Epithet* of your own chusing, may it be your Character: The *Bold Critick*. Such a number of gross Absurdities crowded into the compass of so few Lines (one short *Parenthesis*) I desire any man to shew me in any Book in the whole world again. And they are *all your own*: not one of them here, as before in the case of *Branchiades Apollo*, borrowed from *Lactantius Placidus*. In the first place, Sir, *Spolium* signifies the *Spoils* (as the *Armour*, and *Badges of Honour*) taken from off the Body of an Enemy slain in open fight; as in *Virgil*, *Actoris Aurunci Spolium*; and not the *Armour* worn by a man while living. So that according to your Correction of the Poet. This *Diomedes* the Son of *Tydeus* must have been (as indeed afterward he

he was) a famous Warriour, must have perform'd all his Exploits, must have been slain in the Wars; and all this long before he was born; nay, he must, after he was slain, and before he was begotten, have danc'd in Armour at his Father's Marriage. For *secondly*, Sir, if you had took time to look into the Author upon whom you were commenting, you would have found that these words were timed at *Tydeus* his Marriage with the Mother of *Diomedes*. And *thirdly*, If you had look'd into any of your Poetical Dictionaries, you would have found, that there were two *Diomedes*, that is, *Diomedes* the Thracian, slain by *Hercules*, and this Argian *Diomedes* the Son of *Tydeus*; and that 'twas the Thracian *Diomedes*, who was so famous for his Man-eating, Chimney nos'd

Horses. And consequent from these Premises you will find;

First, That your *Argos* is nothing at all to the

purpose. *Secondly*, That *Euhippus* was substantial Flesh and Blood, and not a mere Noun Adjective. And *thirdly*, From hence may the Reader take this Information, that a Book may have a great many Greek and Latin words in it, and bear a mighty shew of Learning, though written by a Man that understands nothing of the matter he is writing upon; and withal; that some of the pages written against Dr. Bentley are of this kind.

V. Manuscript — p. 87.

p. 87.

W. Stuff!

V. Num. X. A Quotation out of *Photius*.

W. A bare mention of the name of *Callimachus* with something of a censure pass'd upon

K

litt

Impius humano viscere pascit equos, Ovid.

Et Diomedis equi spirantes naribus ignem, Lucret.

him with several other Writers in a Lump.
 V. Num. XI. A choice Epigram out of *Natalis Comes*.

W. Ill have nothing to do with *Natalis Comes*.

V. Num. XII. An Epigram out of the Collection of the *Epigrammata veterum* with this Title.

Callimachi

Imagini inscriptum Jovis.

Quenam hæc forma Dei? cur versa est? Fulgura lucis

Divina non fect debila hæc acies, &c.

Which Epigram (p. 49.) if I am not mistaken, the late Editors of *Callimachus* have not mentioned.

W. You are mistaken, Sir. 'Tis in both the last Edition of *Grævius's*, and in the Edition last before that of *Dacier*; in both of them *Inter Testimonia veterum*. Oh shameful! Not so much as turn'd over the very first Leaves of the Book you were making your Comments upon!

V. Num. XIII. A Citation out of *Malela*.

W. Omitted by the Dr. (I confidently presume) for the same reason, as were those out of *Natalis Comes*.

V. The Learned Editor of that Historian for *Eresia* reads *Actiis*.

W. The Learned Editor of that Historian saith not a word of the matter.

V. Perhaps it should be *αἰῶσι*.

W. An easie Correction of *ἔρσις* into *αἰῶσι*. For there be two of the same Letters in both words, &c. And besides what have the *Etesian Winds* to do with the *Racing-Chariots*?

Did

Did those Chariots go with Sails? *vide loc. Metel. p. 221.*

V. *Callimachus* wrote of Winds, and therefore perhaps the true reading is in the Text, and should be translated *de Etesis*.

W. What need therefore of such a forced Correction. *πεί ἀνέμων* we know *Callimachus* wrote, but I never yet heard of any Book of his Entitled, *Ἐτήσια*.

V. And 'tis not altogether improbable, (but) that *Suidas* might mention his *Ἄρτια*, if a small Correction be allow'd, and instead of *ἄρτι δὲ ἀνέμων* *ἔτι καὶ ταῦτα*, we read *ἔτι καὶ Ἄρτια*, *Ἰς Ἀρίεις*, &c. But this opinion wants the Countenance of a *Manuscript*.

W. There was no manner of occasion for this *Learning* of yours in this place. You'll never meet with any such thing in a MS. Or if you do, I'll venture to tell you before-hand, that MS. is faulty. He that hath the least *Gust* of the *Greek Language* will tell you, that the *καὶ* and the *ταῦτα* cannot here be parted. But somewhat you must be a doing. A *Critick* without his *Corrections*, *Editions*, and *MSS.* is like a *Beau* without his *Wig*, *vid. Mr. B. p. 146.* ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΘΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΟΝ, & Dr. B's Answ. p. 113.

And here ends your *Supplement*, upon which let us now cast up accounts, and see how deeply the *Learned World* stands indebted to you.

This *Collection* of yours, as you call it, consists of XIII Capital Figures; of which Num. p. 88, I, II. transcribed from Mr. Stanley's MS. are somewhat to the purpose, and will, 'tis likely, be inserted in the next Impression of *Callimachus*. III, VII, IX, XII. printed in the last

Edition, IV, V, VI, X. a bare mention of the Name of *Callimachus*. The Epigram of XI. no more *Callimachus's* than your own. VIII, XIII. the substance of them both in the Dr's Collection over and over. But as for those *indifferent* names which you have tack'd to them, Dr. Bentley scorn'd to make use of such Authorities. So that, Sir, not to flatter you, the service you have done to the *Learned World* by presenting it with this your *Supplement* is just none at all: or the very utmost you can pretend to, is the having transcribed from Mr. Stanley's MS. the two Quotations out of *Suidas*. But as for those *usefull and accurate Observations* which you have added, as that of the *Catuli Melitæi*, and *Diomedes's* his Armour, they are purely your own. And if Mr. *Grævius*, or any one else shall think fit to insert them in the next *Impression* of *Callimachus's Works*, 'tis pity but that the world should be inform'd to whom it is obliged for them. In the mean time, I have not been wanting in my Endeavours to blazon your Atchievements, and make the *Learned World* take notice of them.

I have now performed all that, as far as you are concerned in it, my Title page promises. For upon the former part of your Book I had once designed a separate consideration. But I am weary of my work, and, I fancy, both your self and the Reader think it high time for me to have done with you. Yet since it might look somewhat suspiciously to take no manner of notice of it, I shall, with all the Brevity imaginable, bestow upon it a cursory Reflection or two.

That

That former part of your Book contains in it a most grievous Accusation. Dr. Bentley's **Injustice** and **Inhumanity** to those Authors who have written before him. Upon which I cannot but in the first place observe to the Reader; that had one designed to have written a *Panegyrick* upon the Dr. one could not have pitch'd upon a more proper Subject for it, than what this man makes choice of for matter of Reproach against him: All this *Injustice* and *Inhumanity* of the Dr. to those Authors who have written before him terminating in this point; That Dr. Bentley hath observed some mistakes that have drop'd from the Pens of several Great Men, who have written before him, and corrected them: a service for which he hath received the publick acknowledgment of persons altogether as considerable in the Commonwealth of Learning, as any of the Retainers to the *Half-Moon Club*. But if the Dr. doth (as indeed he pretty often doth) disagree from the opinions of those Great Men, who have written before him, it is, though sometimes with the assurance of a man that knows what he is speaking of, yet always, with a due respect and deference to the worth of the persons from whom he Dissents. But let us proceed to particulars.

V. Dr. Bentley calls *Emilius Portus*, hominum *futilissimum*, the greatest of Triflers, *ep. ad fin. Mal. p. 51.*

W. *Emilius Portus* was but a puny Critick, and to persons of his Character there is no Epithet oftner apply'd, than that of *futilissimus*. We have had it once before, *supr p. 122.*

Vide quæ de Emilio Porto Pearsonus in Prolegom. ad Hierocl. Emilius Portus, qui Suidam adeo infeliciter transfudit, &c.

Ibid.

V. Nor can Gerard Vossius, and Johnsius escape being treated by him with the like Language.

W. 'Tis a most notorious falsehood.

Ibid.

V. Who suffer'd themselves to be led into an Error through their Ignorance.

W. *In errorem inscii inciderant*, D. B. ep. p.

51. The word *inscii*, here is to be translated unwarily, incogitantly, not ignorantly. And but that these great men were guilty of a strange Incogitancy as to the matter the Dr. was speaking of, is a thing which cannot be deny'd, *vide locum*. You must learn to construe a piece of Latin, before you write another Book against Dr. Bentley.

Ibid.

V. The same most Learned Vossius he severely arraigns in another place of committing a great mistake without Consideration and Judgment.

W. You misconstrue the Dr. again, and turn his words to a sense directly contrary to what they intend, Dr. B. ep. p. 83. *non certo judicio, sed inconsideratè, præterque morem egisse videtur*. The sense of the Dr's words is plainly this, That though Vossius had written the Name *Malela* without an *s*, yet 'twas not his *certum judicium*, not his own Judgment, or his own standing opinion, that it ought always to be so written; for that his own practice contradicted: but he wrote it so, *inconsideratè, præterque morem, inaccurate-ly*, incuriously, or (if you will have it so) inconsiderately; *præterque morem*, and contrary to his usual practice. For the whole stress of the Dr's argument is, that 'twas not Vossius's his standing opinion, that the name *Malela* ought to be written without an *s*. and consequently

quently, that his writing it so, could not be through *ignorance*, or mistake, or for *want of judgment*; but purely either through inadvertency, or rather with a contented unexactness in compliance with some other Authors who had used that way of writing it. So that you here charge the Dr. with charging *Vossius* with *want of judgment*, when the Dr. is arguing *directly* the contrary, and *discharging* him from that suspicion. Here's *Justice* and *Judgment* joyn'd together!

V. He speaks of the most Learned Man of ^{P. 8.} the later Greeks, *Leo Allatius*, as if he were [a Brute] *not so much a Man, as a composition of Ill-nature and Envy.*

W. The flourish of [a Brute] is of your own making. The Dr. allows him the Title of *eruditissimus*, ep. p. 50. As for the other part of his character, ep. p. 51. See how, after *Bochart*, the Learned Dr. *Th. Smith* speaks of *Leo Allatius* in his *Narratio de vitâ, &c. Cyrilli Lucarii*; as in many other places, so particularly, p. 113. *Leo Allatius*—*suspecta fidei testis, & ad convitiandum propensissimus*. An unlucky Quality, Sir, especially where there's no good one (which was not *Allatius's* case) to counterbalance for it.

V. He endeavours to prove *Erasinus*, *Scaliger*, and *Grotius*, men of no Palate in matters of Learning; or Fools.

W. A most *notorious* falshood.

V. And accuses them of a most *foul error*.

W. But 'tis a most *foul error* in you to say so. He accuses not *them* of a *most foul error*, but the *Copies* of *Plutarch* of a very faulty *Lecti-on*, which he wonders indeed none of those

great Men should have observed. Here follows your *own* Correction of the Dr's Correction. 'Tis like all the other things that are your *own*. You don't understand what the Dr's at, Sir, *Μεσινόν διδάσκει*. The Dr's *Criticism* runs more upon the *διδάσκει* than the *Μεσινόν*. And therefore your *Marginal* Learning is (like every thing else you write) nothing to the purpose.

P. 9.

V. He allows not *Florus Christianus*, *Scaliger*, or any other of the Moderns to have understood the true *measures* of an *Anapaestic* Verse.

W. Of which presumption Mr. *Boyle* long before your self had accused the Dr. and in a much livelier manner; and before your Book came out had received the Dr's answer to it. Mr. B. p. 159. Dr. B's Answer, p. 132. & seqq. Is not the republishing *baffled* Objections without taking a Syllable notice of the Answer which had been before given to them, a piece of Impertinence?

P. 10.

V. He speaks very courtesly of *Lilius Gyraldus*, and Monsieur *Menage*.

W. 'Tis false. He never speaks of them otherwise than very respectfully.

Ibid.

V. He takes occasion frequently to *quarrel* with, and correct *Isaac Casaubon*.

W. That he *quarrels* with *Isaac Casaubon* is falsely spoken. 'Tis true, Dr. *Bentley* hath observed that great Man to have made (as the *greatest of men* have done) some mistakes; and some of them he takes occasion to correct; but this is not *quarrelling* with him. Dr. *Bentley* admires *Isaac Casaubon*, and never speaks of him but in terms of respect.

V. He

V. He censures the Commentators upon *Ibid.*

Pliny.

W. The worst you can make of his *censure* upon the Commentators upon *Pliny* is, that they were *Learned Men*, but not *omniscient*. He takes notice of a particular passage in that Author of which the Commentators had fail'd to give a right Explication, but saith he, *ὅς αὐτὸν ἴσκει*, *No man seeth all things*. A severe Censure !

V. He condemns *Meursius* of Ignorance.

Ibid.

W. 'Tis false. The Dr. hath indeed, p. 40. these words concerning *Meursius*, *Horum versuum ignoratione totâ viâ erravit Joannes Meursius*. The meaning of which is this: *Julius Pollux*, l. 7. c. 33. produces upon a certain occasion the Authority of that Ancient Comic Poet *Eubulus*, and gives it in *Eubulus* his own words. That Quotation being written in *Iambic Verse* (a sort of *Metre* next to *Prose*) and having nothing in it of a *Poetical Air* (as containing only a Catalogue of Names) and standing in *Pollux* continued with the rest of the Text; *Meursius* mistakes it for the words of *Pollux* himself, and not of the Author whose name *Pollux* cites to it: and *horum versuum ignoratione*, mistaking this Quotation for *Prose*, whereas indeed it was *Verse*; and taking it for the words of *Pollux*, whereas they were indeed *Eubulus's*; upon this mistake, *totâ viâ erravit*, he was quite out in his Explication of that passage. But that, Sir, was a mistake (as any one that shall consult the place will see) more easily committed than corrected. And Dr. *Bentley's* taking notice of it was no condemning *Meursius* of Ignorance. Shew me where in any of his writings, Dr. *Bentley* calls

calls *Meursius* an ignorant Man, and I'll retract every word I have spoken on his behalf. Sir, I must tell you again, that before you write any more *Critical Books*, you must understand *Latin* a little better, and learn to *translate* properly.

Ibid.

V. He condemns *Quintilian* too: As if *Quintilian* did not know the true *reading* of a word in *Cicero*, as well as *Dr. Bentley*. But I thought *Quintilian* a creditable Authority.

W. Credible, Sir, you mean. But I have mended your *Form* for you upon this Article. What you speak of is this passage in *Tully*, *De inventione, hujus constitutionis Hermagoras inventor esse existimatur*. And *Ibid.* *Quod si magnam in his Hermagoras habuisset facultatem*. In both these places *Quintilian* reads it *Hermagora*. I dare say, the ingenious Mr. Boyle, who, 'tis plain, by his *Stile*, hath a *Musical Ear*; after all which (rather than lose a *flourish*) he hath said upon the matter, is on the Dr's side against *Quintilian*. With the Dr. stand all the MSS. and so would any man that hath *aures non Asininas*. But I believe, as to this affair, you are sincere, and do think the Dr. too presumptuous.

V. Nay, the Dr. saith, that though *Tully* himself should affirm he had written so; yet the Dr. would not believe *Tully* himself. No, Dr. *Bentley* would not submit to *Tully* himself. *Tully* the Master of Elquence and Standard of good Language.

W. 'Tis true the Dr. doth say, (p. 80.) *Ego vero Ciceronem ita scripsisse ne ipsi quidem Ciceroni affirmanti crediderim*. Bold words, I confess. But, Sir, you must allow the Dr. to

rhe-

rhetoricat now and then. I have known an whole Book, as large as yours and mine put together, made up of nothing but *Rhetorizations*; and yet it took very well and turn'd to better account to the Bookseller, than the best that ever he printed.

V. He calls *Malela* a Mule

P. 11.

W. Nay the Dr. is very rude to *Malela*, that's *V. D. D.* the truth on't. Make a Collection, Sir, of the Dr's Complements upon his Author *Malela*, and print them by way of a second *Appendix* to the next Edition of your Book. You'll expose him most terribly. *Amabo te, Syrisce; serigne hæc an joco? Quæ te enim larvæ atque intemperie agitabant cum hæc scriberes? πᾶσι τοι γέγραπται ἐν πονηρίᾳ; Multi sunt ista, non hominis—Os hominis! Ob hominis stuporem! ab istâ pecude, &c.* These are the Dr's Civilities to the Author of the foregoing Papers. But as for your own Civilities, Sir, in the following part of the same page (11.) I leave them to be fairly divided between your self and your Friends.

H. Hodii, Prolegom. in Malel.

V. He indites and arraigns the Reverend *P. 12, 16.* *Justin Martyr, Clemens. Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Theodoret, and Athenagoras* of Forgery.

W. 'Tis a most notorious falshood.

V. He flies higher and brings the *Rational P. 17.* and *Learned S. Paul* under his Pounces.

W. Very clumsily express'd, Sir. Dr. Bentley is not the first man that hath offered at a Conjectural Emendation of the Text of the New Testament. I hope, Sir, though you talk so much of *Scripture, Fathers, and Councils*; yet you are no *Clergy-man*. I should be very sorry to hear, that a man who takes such delight in reviling his Betters belongs to the Gown.

V. He

P. 23.

V. He falls foul upon his most beloved Friend Dr. Hody, exposing his Exposition of the *Orphic Ericapeus* with an air peculiar to himself.

W. The Reverend and Learned Dr. Hody is Dr. Bentley's most beloved Friend. *Amicissimus noster atque eruditissimus HODIUS* are the Dr's own words, ep. p. 1. to which he adds, p. 93. *cui multum olim debebit historia Ecclesiastica.*

But what a strange thing is this! That a man should set up for a *Critick* and *Censor* of other mens works, without having ever read so much as the very *Title page* of the Book upon which he is making his Reflections. Sir, if you had but read so much as the *Title-page* to *Malela's Chronology* (as 'tis very plain *Latin*, I believe you could have construed it) you would have found, that Dr. Hody was no more concerned in this Exposition of the *Orphic Ericapeus* than your self. The *Title-page* of that Book bears, *JOANNIS ANTIOCHENI, &c. cum interpret. & Notis EDM. CHILMEADI — Præmittitur dissertatio de Authore per HUMFREDUM HODIUM.* Dr. Hody, you see, Sir, was neither the Interpreter nor Commentator upon that Book, but only the *Editor*, and *Writer* of the *Dissertation* concerning the Author. And yet this same most horrible Blunder you have over again, p. 89. Or if you had turned to the place it self, that you are speaking of, *Malel. Chronogr. p. 90.* you would have found, that this Exposition, as it was not Dr. Hody's, so neither was it Mr. Chilmead's, but Mr. I. Gregory's, taken out of his *Miscellany Tracts* published in *English 4to. p. 147.* Here's a *Critick* for you, as well read in what he has not seen, as in what he has.

V. De.

V. Despising the Author as well as the Criticism with an, *it is not my province to trample on what lies prostrate at my feet.*

W. But *τοὺς καμίνους ἐπιβάνειν*, is, *mortuus insilire*, Sir. To trample on those that lie prostrate, as dead men in their Graves, not as vanquish'd Enemies at the feet of the Conqueror. You must learn to construe Greek and Latin, Sir, before you write any more Books in Critick. Yet even did *this* man think himself good enough to undertake Dr. Bentley.

Observe it, Reader, and consider the consequence : when once *Banter* hath broke in upon a man's Reputation, how securely *Ignorance* will follow its Leader.

I have done with you, Sir. And I think there is not one single Article advanced against the Dr. throughout your whole Book, of which I have not given a fair account. Or if some little things may have escaped me, I promise you, to give them, upon demand, the regard they shall deserve. As for what I have written, some few little odd Exceptions you may make to here and there a particular passage: I saw them, and I pass'd them over ; I was willing to leave you here and there a *Cavilling-Gap*, and 'twere but on purpose to draw you on, and lay before you the Temptation of exposing your self to fresh Disgraces. But take my advice, Sir, *Fas est & ab hoste doceri : Return your Sword into P. 31.* its Scabbard, and let's hear no more of you. You are not a person made for the *humbling* of Dr. Bentley. You have not the way of doing these things; The *Stile*, the *Wit*, and the *Delicate Turn* : nothing in you but blunt Confidence. Your Friends (if you have any that will deal freely

freely with you) will tell you the same.

One word to the *Postscript*, and I have done. That that *Postscript* is not of your own writing, I have before told you, I am certain. My reason for it is, because 'tis written in *English*, in a Stile and Language that a man may understand it. Be the Author of it who he will; all that I shall say to him is this; That since he hath so officiously made all the *Malice* and *Ignorance* of your Book his own: all that is said to you let him take to himself.

I had designed in imitation of your *Honourable Patron's* charitable Instructions to *Dr. Bentley*, to have concluded my Address to you also with two or three Articles of *Advice*. But I am afraid 'twould be lost Labour. And besides, several hints of this Nature you will find loosely scatter'd abroad in the foregoing Papers, which you may easily draw together, and make what use of them you please. One thing let me most seriously and importunately beg of you, which is this; If you are resolved still to go on writing in this kind, let the Bible alone. For in good earnest, 'tis a most scandalous thing, to see a man so gravely quoting Texts of *Scripture*, when he is upon so *unchristian* a work as is that of *bearing false Witness* against his *Neighbour*. I am,

S I R,

Your Unknow, &c.

APPENDIX.

TO the Reader whose Curiosity shall lead him to *collate* the MS. at the *Half-Moon* with the Dr's printed *Collection*, I have yet a farther Request to make, which is this; That he would at the same time *collate* the Countenance of the *Bookseller* there with his *Appendix*. This *Appendix* of Mr. *Bennet's*, I hear, is look'd upon as an unanswerable piece, and such as sticks harder upon the Dr. than any thing that hath yet been printed against him. As for my part, I have a clear different notion of it, and think that Mr. *Bennet* could not have done the Dr. a greater piece of service than he hath by writing this *Appendix*, wherein he hath so fairly driven the matter to an head, and let such light into the cause, that it can be no longer a Dispute, where the Quarrel began, and what was that unsufferable affront which rendred the Dr. an Enemy unfit to receive Quaster. As it principally relates to some private Transactions between the Dr. and himself, it cannot be expected that I should account for every Particular. I shall only select out of it some of the more remarkable passages; and raise my *Queries* upon them.

Mr. *Bennet's* Appendix, p. 99. I apply'd [myself to the Dr. for the use of the MS. not as his Majesty's Library-Keeper, but] as a Friend ve-

ry conversant in these things, who liv'd not far from the Royal Library, and could procure the MS. for me : n. b. as a Friend.

Ibid. p. 102. The Dr. called in every now and then at my Shop, for we were then in good terms together, and he was pleas'd to consult me sometimes about Matters in my way.

Hereupon let the Collator look Mr. Bennet full in the face, and ask him a civil Question or two.

Query. And were not those *disobliging* Expressions relating to Mr. Boyle and the *work* he was upon, utter'd by Dr. Bentley during the time that the Dr. and your self, Mr. Bennet, were very good *Friends* together, and while the Dr. was so familiar and confiding with you, as to *consult* you sometimes about Matters in your way ? And particularly was it not within this Period of time that the Dr. *threw out* that *capitally great & cetera* Reflection which you speak of, *pag.* 131 ? And is it not enough to make a man afraid, Mr. Bennet, of calling in at the Sign of the *Half-Moon* ? and ought not a man to have a care how he moves his Lips there ? least his words should be catch'd up as they drop from his Mouth, and afterwards, it may be, *affidavited* against him, put into print, and made part of a Lampoon upon him. These are dangerous Considerations, Mr. Bennet, and a sufficient caution to a man, how he enters into too near a familiarity with the Bookseller at the *Half-Moon*. For though you and I may stand at present in good terms with each other, yet who knows, who and who may be together a Twelvemonth hence ?

Upon this I expect Mr. Bennet should reply to this purpose.

Mr. Bennet. What a malicious Suggestion is here? Why have I not told you already in print, that I did all I could to avoid the doing what you charge me with? And *sincerely*, Sir, and I *protest*, and I *solemnly declare*, and all that I say is true to a Title: and I hope you'll believe me, Sir, sooner than you will Dr. Bentley; I all along contended from Mr. Boyle the many slight and injurious things Dr. Bentley threw out now and then both of him and the work he was about. And *sincerely*, Sir, I *sincerely* endeavoured as much and as long as I was able to have prevented the breach. For though this Controversie hath turned to good account to me: yet I wish with all my heart I could have kept clear of it my self. For in the way of my business, you know, it had been more to my advantage to have preserved the good will of both of them.

Collator. But of the two, you were like to be less a loser by losing the Dr. than by losing Mr. Boyle. For 'tis well known, Mr. Boyle is not in this affair a single man, and had he gone to another Shop, he'd have carry'd off an whole shoal along with him.

Mr. B. You mistake me, Sir, I am above those things.

Coll. Why did you mention them then?

Mr. B. But how could I help it? Mr. Boyle calls me to account over and over, and examines me so *strictly*, there was no avoiding telling the world all I knew. For, Sir, Mr. Boyle's whole Book, in a manner, turns upon mine and Dr. King's Depositions. For had not we made out the

Affront for him, how would he have been able to have made out his Book ?

Coll. Very true. But methinks your *Depositions* lean a little on one side.

Mr. B. *Sincerely*, Sir, and I *protest*, all that I have said, is *punctually true*, true to a *Tittle*, Sir. If Dr. *Bentley* tells stories of me, God forgive him for't. But as for what I have *deposed* ; Sir, I have set my hand to it, and am ready (if duly required) to take my Oath upon it.

Coll. All these *Asseverations* might have been spared, and the cause have fared never the worse. But you have given *two* accounts, Mr. *Bennet* : which of those *two* accounts is true to a *Tittle* ? The *first* account given in Mr. *Boyle's* Book, or the *second* account of your own *Appendix*.

Mr. B. Both of them, Sir ; true to a *Tittle* both of them. And I am ready to take my oath upon it. *Sincerely*, Sir, I am : I solemnly *affirm*.

Coll. But Mr. *Bennet*, he that takes upon him to speak as a *sworn Witness* ought to declare the *whole* Truth, as well as nothing *but* the Truth. In such cases purposely to *conceal* any considerable circumstance is next of kin to the *inventing* of one ; since the Truth may be on both sides equally *disguised*. And a wilfull *disguising* of the Truth, whether it be by *Substraction* or *Addition*, with the Solemnity of an Oath, or of an *Asseveration* equivalent to an Oath, deserves an harder name than I will give it. And so Mr. *Bennet*, let's compare a little your *first* account with your *second*.

Mr. B. They are both of them *punctually* true, true to a *Tittle*.

Coll.

Coll. Truth is *one*; and I am sure these are *two*.

Mr. Bennet's *first* account in Mr. Boyle's Book, p. 6. I was employ'd by the Honourable Mr. Boyle (and by him only) to borrow the MS. of Phalaris from Dr. Bentley. After about nine Months-solicitation it was delivered into my Custody.

Coll. Was Dr. Bentley Library-Keeper, Mr. Bennet, during this nine Months time that you were soliciting for the MS?

Mr. B. I crave your pardon for *that*, Sir: you don't find me saying any such thing.

Coll. Ay, but Mr. Bennet, to deal plainly with you, here were you guilty of a very fraudulent Concealment. No honest man, or one that had been minded to do Justice, would have express'd himself so loosely when he was speaking as upon Oath. This was a very gross Omission, Mr. Bennet, and 'tis to be feared, a wilfull one. The Dr's being Library-Keeper, or not Library-Keeper during that nine Months time, is so material a circumstance, that it gives a clear different cast to the whole matter of fact, and makes all Mr. Boyle's Book run upon a very foul mistake: and 'tis scarce to be imagined, that the Omission of a circumstance upon which so much depended, and which express'd would have spoil'd all Mr. Boyle's Book, was purely an Oversight.

Mr. B. This business of the nine Months Solicitation is fairly stated in my Appendix.

Coll. Ay, Mr. Bennet. But that was not till Dr. Bentley had first stated it for you, and stated it upon such Authorities there was no contesting. Otherwise the Town might still have

been, by the help of your faithfull relation, with Mr. Boyle's Paraphrase upon it, no less than eight Months in nine out in their reckoning. But let's see how Mr. Boyle manages your first account, and what Explication he gives of it.

Mr. B. p. 2. *About four or five years ago, the worthy Dean of Christ-Church, Dr. Aldrich, desired me to undertake an Edition of Phalaris. In order to it a Manuscript in the King's Library was to be consulted. I sent to Mr. Bennet, my Bookseller in London to get the Manuscript, and desired him to apply himself to Dr. Bentley in my name for the use of it, not doubting in the least a ready compliance with such a Request from one of his Station and Order. After an expectation of many Months, Mr. Bennet sends me at last a Collation of part of the MS. with this account, that he had with a great difficulty, and after long delays, got the MS. into his hand. And again, p. 19. The Reader is desired to take notice, that there was about nine Months Sollicitation used to procure it; a longer time than — the Ceremony of his Inauguration to his Library-Keeper's place could require.*

Sparkling Lines! in which, if there be any design beyond Phrase, it must be this, to intimate to the Reader, that the Dr. was, for at least, a great part of that nine Months time Library-Keeper, and had the MS. in his custody. Or if we must not look for meaning here, where he is only pouring out words, yet in the former passage he seems to speak plain Sense, and in the more simple and historical Stile.

Query Therefore; what Station can Mr. Boyle there intend? must it not be that of Library-Keeper

Keeper to his Majesty? Nay, is not this made
 the aggravating circumstance of the whole *mat-
 ter of fact*, that one in the Dr's *Station* should
 refuse so common a favour, (such Mr. Boyle Mr. B p. 9.
 steems the use of the King's MSS.) to a person
 of his Quality. That a *Library-Keeper* should
 be no more obliging to a *Gentleman-Scholar*. Id p 11, 17.
 That the Library at St. James's should be, next Id. p. 15,
 to that at Fez, (a strange leap of Thought) 267, conf.
 the most inaccessible in the world; that there sum 20, 40,
 should be no approaching the King's Library 105, & p.
 without a Fee; that the King of England's Li- 220, &c.
 brary should have such a *Dunce* for it's Keeper,
 so poor a *Scholar*, and so little knowing how
 to behave himself to a *Gentleman*, that he ought
 to be turned out of his place. But I need not
 tell any one who hath but once cast his Eyes up
 on Mr. Boyle's Book, how plentiful he is of his
 Civilities to the *Library-Keeper* at St. James's.
 So I am sure the Town took it, that the whole
 ground of the Quarrel between Dr. Bentley and
 Mr. Boyle lay in the Dr's refusing to a person
 of Mr. Boyle's Quality the use of a Book out
 of the *Library* of which he was *Keeper*, and
 consequently the proper person to whom such
 an Application was to be made. This false re-
 presentation of the *matter of fact* was necessary
 in order to the use Mr. Boyle had to make of it,
 which was to justify the peculiar Liberties it
 was resolved that young *Gentleman* should take
 with one of his Majesty's Servants. This mi-
 stake Mr. Bennet's first account favours, and up-
 on that first account of Mr. Bennet doth Mr.
 Boyle build his whole Book. The *disobliging
 delays*, and *great difficulties* Dr. Bentley put them
 to in procuring the MS. and when at last they

had it, the little time he let it lie in their hands. All which being a *partial, disguised, and distorted* relation of the *matter of fact*, and so contrived on purpose to mislead the Reader, he that shall publickly attest it, by giving it under his hand in print, and make an offer of affirming it upon Oath for a *faithfull* relation, deserves as *course a Complement* as the Dr. gave him.

Append. p.

93.

But let us proceed to Mr. Bennet's *second* account, and see how he qualifies the matter there.

Mr. Bennet's Appendix, p. 99. *There was not a single word in my relation, that doth in the least imply me to have thought the Dr. Library-Keeper the whole time I ask'd him for the MS. I only apply'd to him as a Friend, very conversant in these things, who lived not far from the Royal Library, had an interest there, and could have procured the MS. for me.*

Idem, p. 103. *I never went to Dr. Bentley upon the Errant of borrowing the MS. I only spoke to him about it sometimes as he stopt at my Shop, or pass'd by it. Though I ask'd him so often (twenty times at least) that I might well say I solicited for it.*

Idem, p. 109. *I admit so far of the Dr's account, that the MS. was delivered, used, and returned within a Month (or rather five weeks) after it was in his Custody. But I apply'd to him seven or eight Months before he was Library-Keeper.*

Idem, p. 110. *He had interest enough to have procured it me, &c.*

Idem, p. 111. *I do not say that the Dr. could have LENT me the Book much sooner than he did. But that he could have GOT the Book to*

he lent to me : or at least, that so he pretended : and that he did so I most sincerely affirm.

Upon this *first* and *second* account of Mr. Bennet's, the *Collator* might teize him with, a world of troublesome questions. As *Coll.* Had you orders, Mr. Bennet, from Mr. Boyle to procure the MS. for him *nine Months* before you got it into your hands ? Mr. B. At least *Coll.* And he directed you to Dr. Bentley for it, and to make use of his *name* to the Dr. for it ? Mr. B. Yes. *Coll.* *Nine Months* before you obtain'd it ? Mr. B. Yes. *Coll.* This was necessary to put a fair gloss upon the matter, but it looks somewhat suspicious. The Dr. was not *Library-Keeper* *nine Months* before you had it ? Mr. B. No. *Coll.* Or in prospect of being *Library-Keeper* ? Mr. B. That he might be. For there was a Rumour of his standing fair for that Office some considerable time before he actually entered upon it. *Coll.* What *nine Months* before ? Mr. B. Perhaps, *Coll.* Scarce so, Mr. Bennet. For I am apt to believe, that for some part of those *nine Months*, Mr. Justel, the Dr's Predecessor in that Office, might be living. And Mr. Boyle being a perfect Stranger to the Dr. it doth not look very probable, that he should send you to Dr. Bentley in his *name*, for a MS. out of the *Royal Library*, when the Dr. neither was *Library-Keeper*, nor at that time so much as in prospect of being so. I am rather inclined to believe, that upon Recollection you would find, that Mr. Boyle for some of the former of those *nine Months*, only gave you orders in general to procure him the MS. and being so long delay'd, in casting up the accounts draws the whole into one Summ, and, to avoid Fractions,

throws it all upon the Dr. Recollect your Thoughts, Mr. Bennet, and judge of the probability of the thing. But again, Mr. Bennet. Did Mr. Boyle ever write any thing himself to Dr. Bentley about the MS? Mr. B. Not that I know of. Coll. Why then Mr. Boyle was not affronted by the Dr. to near that degree he would make the world believe. How can he make such a stir about being refused a favour which he never condescended to ask? Mr. B. But he employ'd me to ask it for him: and that's the same thing. Coll. No, Mr. Bennet, not altogether the same thing. But to let that pass. How long was the Dr. *actually* Library Keeper and in possession of the Key, before you had the MS? Mr. B. Not long *actually* Library-Keeper. Coll. But how long? Mr. B. A Fortnight, or three Weeks, it may be, or thereabouts. Coll. What a fall is here, Mr. Bennet? This *nine Months* delay, I find, is sunk into a *Fortnight* or *three Weeks*: Is this your *faithfull Relation*? Mr. B. But he *liv'd* at that end o'th' Town, and he had *interest* enough there to have *procured* it for me, if he had been so minded. Coll. But suppose the Dr. did not think himself obliged, Mr. Bennet, to runs on your Errands? Mr. B. My Errands? 'twas Mr. Boyle's Errands. Coll. Mr. Boyle never wrote a word to him about it. Mr. B. But when I spake to him of it, he promis'd that *he would help me to it*, and that I *sincerely affirm*. Coll. That is, he would help you to it, when it should come to be in his own power to help you to it. And so he did. For no sooner was he *actually* posses'd of his place, than that he delivered it to you. Did he promise to run about from one to another to BOR-

ROW

ROW it for you? But how long was it after he
 was *actually* in possession of his Office e'er you
 had the MS? Mr. B. About a Fortnight or
 three Weeks, I tell you; or it may be, some-
 what more. Coll. But how long do ye think
 at most? Mr. B. Why, it may be, a *Month*.
 See what I have written, p. 105, 106. Coll.
 I have read those pages you refer to, and con-
 sider'd them. There's nothing there but
 wild and groundless *Supposition*, all of your own
 making. And as for every word you have said
 there, I am as much at liberty to *suppose* the di-
 rect contrary to what *you* suppose. And how
 then would you help your self? And therefore
 passing over that for a *Nothing*, let me ask you.
 How many times were you with the Dr. about
 it after he was *Library-Keeper*? Mr. B. With
 him about it? I was never with him about it
 at all, either before or after. I only spake to
 him of it, as I met him now and then by chance.
 There was no need of my taking journeys to him. P. 103.
 'twas but just giving him a word or two, now
 and then, as he *stept into my Shop or pass'd by it*.
 There was nothing at all of trouble in it. Coll. So
 'tis in your *second* account indeed, but in your
first account, which you sent to Mr. Boyle to
 Oxford, 'twas not without *great difficulty*, that
 after long delays, at last you got it into your
 hands. Mr. B. Why, I ask'd him for't so of-
 ten, *twenty* times at least. Coll. But without e-
 ver stepping *twenty* Inches out of your way for
 it. A great difficulty! And yet both your ac-
 counts are true to a *Tittle*. Well! but after
 he was *Library-Keeper* you soon had it. Mr.
 B. But not what the Dr. saith, as soon as he
 was *Library-Keeper*. There I think I have
 caught

caught the Dr. But see the whole matter in my
Appendix it self, p. 104, 105. *Coll.* But to
 shorten the matter, tell it your self by word of
 Mouth. Mr. B. Why then I say I have caught
 the Dr. in a *fallshood*, Sir, and can prove it up-
 on him out of his own Mouth. *Coll.* That's
 a *Complement* very familiar with you. But
 how? Mr. B. Why, he saith, that *as soon as it*
was in his power he gave it me. But it was not
 till *three Weeks* after, or, it may be, more.
 And is that *as soon as*? *Coll.* Why no truly.
 In strictness of Speech, he should *as soon as ever*
 he had received the Key, *immediately, forth-*
with, the *very same Minute* have run into the
 Library, snatch'd up the MS. clapt it in his
 Pocket, and without staying so much as to
 comb his Periwig, have posted away with it
 to the *Half-Moon*. And then he might have
 said *as soon as*. Mr. B. Do you *banter* me?
 It may cost you dear. I have them that can
banter with you for your ears, in *Versè* and *Prose*.
Coll. But how long was it *after* he had it in
 his power e'er you receiv'd it? Mr. B. Why
three Weeks, I tell you, or, it may be, more.
 And is that, *as soon as*? *Coll.* But how did you
 come by it at last? Mr. B. Why I met him in the
 Street, I renew'd my Request to him about the
 MS. He told me I should have it, bad me
 send my Prentice to him, I sent him, and he
 delivered it. *Coll.* And so you had it? Mr.
 B. And so I had it. But not *as soon as*—There
 the Dr's *Memory failed him*. *Coll.* But had
 you *seen* the Dr. *after* he was *Library-Keeper*
 any time *before* this time that you ask'd him for
 the MS and had it? Mr. B. I had ask'd him
 for it *twenty times* before. *Coll.* What, *after*
 he

he was *Library-Keeper*? Had you so much as once seen him, or spake to him, or sent to him about it, *after* he was *Library-Keeper*, *before* this time that you ask'd for it, and had it? Mr. B. Not *after* he was *Library-Keeper*, but I know not how many times *before*. Coll. That is *before* it was in his *power* to lend it you. But *after* it was in his *power* you no sooner ask'd than receiv'd. Mr. B. But he might have *procured* it for me *before*. Coll. And that's all you have to say for your self. There's not a word of this *procuring* it for you in your *first* account. A poor come-off, Mr. Bennet. Mr. B. But how will you *reconcile* the Dr. with *himself*? In one place he saith, *As soon as it was in my power, I went voluntarily and offer'd it him*: in another place; Mr. Bennet meeting me again renewed the former Request, and I readily granted it; and in another place, that he order'd me to send my Prentice to his Lodgings for it. These are Inconsistencies which Dr. Bentley may perhaps reconcile, but I dare say, no body else can. Coll. You have learn'd the confident Turn, I see. But how, where, what are these Inconsistencies? Mr. B. How could the Dr. voluntarily come and offer it me, and yet not grant it, till meeting him again I renewed my Request to him? Coll. In the first place, Mr. Bennet, I must observe to you, that this little variation of circumstance in the Dr.'s relating the matter is very inconsiderable, and such as doth not affect the main of the cause; And therefore not worth the while of having a Lye made for it. And, Mr. Bennet, after all the pains that you and your Friends have been at to prove the Dr. a Liar in print, you must still give me leave to believe of the Dr. what

P. 120.

what you desire the Reader to believe of your self, that he is not a man, *who loves to tell Lies for no manner of purpose.* For whether the Dr. (*after his being actually Library-Keeper*) first spake to you of the Manuscript, or you first spake to the Dr. the case remains still the same, that, *after he was Library-Keeper*, you *no sooner* ask'd for it than you had it. But secondly, I see not that *Inconsistency* in the Dr's relation upon which you make such a *Flourish.* For let me but suppose what I believe to be in *fact* true, that this meeting was the *first* Interview the Dr. and you had *after his being posses'd of the Keys:* then, Mr. Bennet, there is nothing more natural on both sides, than either for you to have *renewed your Request* to the Dr. about the MS. or for the Dr. to have *made the offer* without your renewing it. So that the whole matter lies upon the chance of who should speak *first.* Let me feign a little *Dialogism* between your self and the Dr. upon this occasion. Meeting him therefore by chance in the Streets (as *Fleetstreet* suppose) you make a stop, and thus accost him.

Mr. Bennet. Sir, your humble Servant. Mr. Boyle *hath wrote to me again about the MS. he begins to grow impatient.*

Dr. Bentley. *That's the business I were coming to you about, Mr. Bennet: I have now at last got the Key of the Library. Send but your Prentice to my Lodgings for it, 'tis at your service.*

Or let us turn it a little otherwise.

Dr. Bentley. Oh, Mr. Bennet, I am glad to meet you. *I were just a coming to you. Well, I have got the Key into my hands at last, and now if you'll send to my Lodgings for it, the MS. is at your Service.*

Mr.

Mr. Bennet. I am glad of that, Sir. I were just a going to have put you in mind of it. We have been waiting for it a long time. Mr. Boyle begins to be impatient.

Dr. Bentley. I could not lend it before I had it to lend. As soon as it is in my keeping, you see, 'tis ready for you. And pray let the Gentlemen know as much.

I confess this is a feigned Dialogue; but, I think there is nothing strained or unnatural in it, and, though I go upon pure dint of Conjecture; yet I fancy it comes as near to the truth of the fact as any thing you have written, Mr. Bennet. Upon such an occasion it is scarce possible but that both you should speak to the Dr. and the Dr. to you about a business which had been so long depending: and much after the manner I have represented it. And take it which way you will, whether the Dr. first spake to you, or you first spake to the Dr. the matter comes much to the same; and the Dr. might justly enough at one time say, that he voluntarily offer'd it to you; and at another time, that you renewed your Request to him about it. For both of them may be literally true. Mr. B. Yes, truly; if you'll put words into my Mouth for me, you may make what you please of me. Coll. Not worse of you than you have made of your self, Mr. Bennet, by printing such an Appendix to such a Book. Let a By-stander judge whether there be any thing unnatural in the matter, as I have represented it. Mr. B. But how can you bring him off as to th'other point. I went voluntarily to him, saith the Dr. and offer'd it him. And yet in another place, I had him send his Prentice to me, - and he should have it.

How

How could he *bring it me himself*, and yet bid me *send my Prentice for it*? Coll. *Bring it you yourself*? Mr. B. Yes, *bring it me himself*, for that *his words were evidently designed to imply*. Coll. What words? Mr. B. These words, *I went voluntarily, and offer'd it to him*. Coll. Do those words *evidently imply*, that he *brought it to you himself*? Mr. B. Yes, marry, do they. Coll. Not at all, Mr. Bennet. Mr. B. But I say they do though. Coll. But I say they do not though. What do *these words, I went voluntarily, and offer'd it to him*, necessarily imply, that he put it up in his Pocket, and delivered it to you with his own hands? Mr. B. I say, that he *designed* the Reader should understand it so. Coll. But, I say, he *designed* no such thing. For, pray Sir, what did he design in these words; *He sent his Prentice to the Library for it by my Appointment*. Mr. B. The meaning of those words is plain enough. Coll. And these words, coming from the same mouth, make the meaning of the other words plain beyond the possibility of a Mis-construction. *I voluntarily went and offer'd it to him*. That is, *I voluntarily went and told him, that now the MS was in my keeping Mr. Boyle might command the use of it, and, Mr. Bennet, if you'll send your Prentice to the Library for it, you shall have it*. In all this, I defy any Mortal to find out any Inconsistency or Contradiction. Is there a Syllable here, that *implies* the Dr. to have brought it to the *Half-Moon* himself? Mr. B. I say, the Dr. *evidently designed them to imply so*. Coll. I say, that's a *Lye, Mr Bennet*. Accept of some of your own *Civilltries*. You and your Friends together have given the Dr. the *Lye* in Print,

Print, and printed *Eyes* upon the Dr. over and over. Accept of some of your *own Civilities*. You may have more of them in time, if you go on. *Mr. B. These are gross words and might tempt me (&c p. 109.)* but that 'tis in my own Shop *Coll. True words, Mr. Bennet.*

Come, come, Mr. Bennet, after all your Shufflings, and double telling your Stories, this business of the *nine Months Sollicitation*, the great difficulty, the disobliging Delays, the rude, uncivil, unmannerly Library-Keeper at St. James's is foul play all over, and direct *Misrepresentation*. And all Mr. Boyle's Book, and all the noise it hath made in the world, runs upon this *foul* account of yours. And that I could out of your own words more palpably confute and confound you than hitherto I have done; put it upon the Tryal and I'll convince you: for (to speak like a Fool) *he that draws his Sword Vindic. p. 31. in this cause, throws away the Scabbard.* What is said already is enough to satisfy an impartial Reader. And as for them, who having once fallen in with a *false Cry*, are resolved to persist in it; let 'em go on: I can't think it worth the while to waste more Paper in stopping their mouths. The case is plain; the Dr. accommodated Mr. Boyle with the use of the MS. as soon as 'twas in his power to lend it, and chose rather to trespass upon the duty of his place, than to be guilty of any thing that might seem want of Respect to a person of that *Honourable Name.*

*Vid Dr.
B's Pref.
p. 23.*

This Story of the MS. is all in all in Mr. Boyle's Book, and therefore I could not balk the opportunity of considering it somewhat particularly, though I have pass'd by many Arguments, which Mr. Bennet's own words afford against

against himself; and particularly as to his careless management of Mr. Boyle's Affairs, and his unjust charging the Consequences of his own Negligence upon Dr. Bentley. The Summ of the whole is this; that the Dr. lent them the SM. as soon as it was in his power to lend it; or if they will not admit of that, as soon as; then, that the only neglect of the Dr. was, that he did not, *strictly* and *literally* speaking, as soon as ever he had gotten the Key of the Library into his keeping, presently, the first thing he did, put the Book into his Pocket, and run to the *Half-Moon* with it. For after he was *Library-Keeper*, as soon as they ask'd for it, they had it. And before that, the only Omission of the Dr. was, that he did not upon Mr. Bennet's and nobody's else speaking to him of the MS (and that only now and then by the bye, as he met him by chance) employ his *Interest* at th'other end o'th' Town to borrow it for him: that is, That Dr. Bentley was not more diligent in *subsolliciting* for Mr. Bennet, than Mr. Bennet was, in *soliciting* for Mr. Boyle. And if Mr. Bennet cannot out of both his *faithfull Relations*, his *first* faithfull Relation, and his *second* faithfull Relation, make any thing more of the matter than this: he must e'en to work again, once more expose himself in print, and fall to *clubbing* for a *third* faithfull Relation. The matter of fact (and I know what I say) in all this Controversie with Dr. Bentley, when once it comes to be squeez'd, contracts into as narrow a compass as the matter of *Learning*, and is (I am not afraid to speak it) all over *Misrepresentation*.

But the grand Article of their Accusation against the Dr. in reference to the MS, and that with which Mr. Boyle was pleased to commence his *Critical War* upon the *Library-Keeper* at St. James's, is still behind, his *Rude* and hasty way of recalling it. Not till after *nine Months* Sollicitation could they get it into their hands, and in less than so many Days it was taken from them again. And here Mr. Bennet undertakes to prove, that the Dr. *Lent* them the MS. with a *Design* of *disappointing* them; of the use of it. A most unaccountable management! To *Lend* a thing with a *Design* of *disappointing* the Borrower of the use of it.

Mr. B. I do not directly charge him with having such an Intention. * He himself gave me the hint; and I may, I hope, without offence repeat his own words. Coll. What that he Lent you the MS. but with a private *Design* of disappointing Mr. Boyle of the use of it? Mr. B. He made a shew of lending it us. Coll. Made a shew of lending it you? I thought he had actually lent it you. Mr. B. He made a shew of lending it us: But that was only to avoid the Scandal of refusing it; managing things in such a manner, as that he might seemingly oblige Mr. Boyle, and yet certainly defeat him. Coll. As how? Mr. B. Lending us the MS. indeed, and so seemingly obliging Mr. Boyle; but taking it out of our hands before the Collation was finished, and so certainly defeating him. Coll. But suppose the Collation had been finished before the MS. had been taken out of your hands; then you had certainly defeated the Dr. And I think he left it in your keeping more days than you needed to have had it hours. So that unless the Dr. had known before,

before-hand, that Mr. Bennet would have proved so *Negligent* a Man as indeed he did, and have taken no manner of Care of Mr. Boyles Affair; 'tis impossible he should have had the least imagination of *disappointing* Mr. Boyle of the use of the MS. But sure, Mr. Bennet, you did not write these things to be believ'd, but to be laugh'd at.

P. 111.

Mr. B. But why, unless he had had some such *Design* in his Head, should he not have ordered me the MS. till just at that particular nick of time, that he was leaving the Town? and then too, without any Intimation how soon it was to be restored? Which is a Circumstance that I am very positive in. Coll. I'll tell you why, Mr. Bennet. Because 'twas but just before just that particular nick of time that he entered upon the Possession of his Office of Library-Keeper to his Majesty, and consequently not much before just that particular nick of time was it in his Power to have lent it you. And I think it was very obligingly done of the Dr. just after he was possesst of the Key of the Library, and just before he was leaving the Town for some Months together; just at that particular nick of time, I say, finding that Mr. Bennet had so far forgot his honourable Friend, as never either to come or send to him about the MS. himself to go to Mr. Bennet, and put him in mind of sending for it. This is the truth of the Case; and this doth not look as if he had a *Design* of *disappointing* Mr. Boyle.

Ibid.

But why, when he did at last trust me with the MS. did he not, at the Delivery of it, give me some Intimation, how soon it was to be restored, that so I might have taken Care to have gotten the Collation finished in due time?

Coll.

Coll. And why, was not that Care taken, whether he had given you any such *Intimation* or not? But he *did* give you such *Intimation*, and expressly order'd you to *bid* your *Collator* lose no time, *for that he was going out of Town for two Months*. Mr. B. This I *utterly deny*: P. 127. He gave me *no* such notice; I *protest* he did not; No, not the least *Intimation* tending that way; No, not so much as in *General*, or that, I *should make what Dispatch I could*. He did not, I *solemnly affirm*. Coll. A very unlikely thing; That he should *lend you a MS. out of the Kings Library, to keep it as long as you pleased*. Men do not use to lend MS. at that rate: And the Dr. *solemnly affirms* the contrarry. Mr. B. *This is a Circumstance that I am very positive in*. Coll. Yes, Sir, There was an absolute necessity for your being *very positive* in this Circumstance. The whole of your Defence depended upon it: For if the Dr. *as soon as it was in his Power*, took Care to supply you with the MS. if he let it lye in your hands *more days, than the Collating it would have taken up hours*; and if withal at the Delivery of it, he gave you notice how soon it was to be restored, and expressly order'd you to *lose no time*; then the Consequence is too plain; and that Mr. Boyle was *disappointed* of the use of the MS. must lie at some other Door than the Dr's. This is a Circumstance therefore there was a necessity of your being *very positive in*. And 'tis very remarkable, and no Man can have read Mr. Bennet's Appendix with the least manner of Attention, but he must have observed it; That Mr. Bennet's style rises and falls just as the occasions of the Cause require. No Man hath his Memory more at Command than

Mr. Bennet, or better knows his Seasons where to be *positive*, and where *suspending*,

Mr. B. To confirm what I say, here's the *Certificate* of my Collator.

P. 128. I do declare, that when Mr. Bennet delivered me the MS. of Phalaris's *Epistles*, there was no time set me for the Return of it. Geo. GIBSON.

From whence I argue thus. If the Dr. had set me so *short* a time, when he put the MS. into my hands, it is utterly improbable, that I should not have given notice of it to Mr. Gibson; especially apprehending the Collation to be a work of more trouble than really it was, and knowing Mr. Gibson's hands to be so full of other Business. But that Mr. Gibson had no such notice from me appears from this Certificate. Coll. Your Argument reduced into Form, I think runs thus. If Dr. Bentley, at the Delivery of the MS. had given me any notice how soon it was to be restored, and bid me lose no time, but make all the Dispatch I could; 'tis utterly improbable, that I should not have given the like notice to Mr. Gibson; but no such notice did I give to Mr. Gibson; therefore 'tis utterly improbable, that Dr. Bentley should have given me any such notice.

Now in this same *Appendix* of Mr. Bennet's p. 107. I meet with part of a Letter from Mr. Boyle of Christ-Church to his Solicitor of the Half-Moon, dated May the 1st. 1694. and beginning in these words.

I am almost ashamed to trouble you any more, Mr. Bennet, about the MS. I wish I had it: But, if at all, I must have it very quickly.

From whence I argue thus; if Mr. Bennet had received any such Letter from Mr. Boyle, requiring

quiring the Collation of the MS. to be transmitted to him with the utmost Expedition, it is *utterly improbable*, that he should not have given some notice of it to Mr. Gibson; but *no* such notice did Mr. Bennet give to Mr. Gibson; therefore *no* such Letter did he receive from Mr. Boyle.

I think this Argument of mine runs exactly parallel with that of Mr. Bennet. But 'tis certain, Mr. Bennet did receive such a Letter from Mr. Boyle, requiring the Collation of the MS. to be procured for him with the utmost Dispatch, and yet gave Mr. Gibson no such notice; therefore it is *not at all improbable*, but that, at the Delivery of the MS. he may have received the like Intimation from Dr. Bentley with the like indifference.

Upon this Certificate of Mr. Bennet's Collator therefore I may remark. First, that it doth *not* prove what Mr. Bennet affirms, that is, That the Dr. did not, at the Delivery of the MS. give Mr. Bennet any Intimation how soon it was to be restored: Which this Certificate of Mr. Bennet's Collator no more proves, than it doth, that Mr. Bennet never received any such Letter from Mr. Boyle. What Mr. Bennet therefore affirms, That this Certificate of his Collator doth *not* prove; No, not so much as to an appearance. But Secondly, what Mr. Bennet would fain deny; That it doth prove beyond the Possibility of Contradiction. Which is, that tho' the Library-Keeper at St. James's bears the blame, yet, 'tis as clear as the Sun, the Bookseller at the Half-Moon was the only Person in fault, that Mr. Boyle was disappointed of the use of the MS. Witness. Mr. Boyle's Letter, Mr. Gibson's Certificate.

P. 103.

Here's a Letter from Mr. Boyle to his *Sollicitor*, requiring the Affair of the MS. to be expedited for him with the utmost Dispath ; I *must have it, if at all*, very quickly. Who'd have expected now upon the receipt of this Letter but that Mr. Bennet should forthwith, the first thing he did, have posted away to *Westminster*, to have acquainted the Dr. with Mr. Boyle's occasions? But no such thing was done. The Dr. liv'd at a *Distance* from *Paul's-Church-Yard*; and 'twas not (as he himself hath told us) Mr. Bennet's way of *Solliciting* to take *Journeys*, or run on other Body's Errands. His way of *Solliciting* was only to speak to the Dr. now and then about the MS. *occasionally*, and as he met him by chance. Nor could the pressing Instances of this Letter of Mr. Boyle's, of *May* the 1st. put him out of his Pace. He is still content to wait till the Dr. should *chance*, to come that way, and *either step into his Shop, or pass by the Door*; and he should *chance* to be in the way to speak to him. And yet, all this while Mr. Boyle in haste for the MS. *I must have it, if at all*, very quickly. Well, but as Mr. Boyle's Letter was luckily dated just about that *particular nick of time*, that the Dr. was entering upon the full Possession of his Office, it being now in his *Power* to lend the MS. accordingly, not many days after the receipt of this Letter, the Dr. comes to Mr. Bennet, Orders him to send his Prentice to the Library for it, and delivers it. And what doth Mr. Bennet do with it when he hath it? He commits the *Collating* of it to a Person whose hands he *knew* to be so full of other Business, that he could not make any tolerable Dispath with it : a *Corrector* to a Press, who could allow (as Mr. Bennet most

Examine

Hexametrically expresses it) *no part of his days from that laborious Service, and had only some few Evening hours at his own Disposal: Nay, and into His too, without giving him any notice in what haste the young Gentleman at Oxford was for the Collation. For the true Reason of Mr. Gibson's being so much behind hand in the Collation, was because the Press employ'd him, and left him no hour* to himself, but in the Evening: And because he had not been careful to make the [very] best use of those. And the true Reason why, Mr. Gibson made not the best use of his hours, was, because Mr Bennet had not, when he delivered him the MS. limited him in his time.*

P. 127.

P. 128.

P. 126.

Mr. B. No, *For Dr. Bentley had not in That matter so limited me. I mean, not ty'd me up to P. 127. days or hours; or given me any notice of the time fix'd, for his Worcester Journey. And that's all my Collator says, That there was no time set him for the Return of it. That is, no time set him to a day. Coll. Nay, but you say, That the Dr. had not given you any Intimation; No, not so much as in General, That you should make what Dispatch you could with it. And as much at large, it seems, you left your Collator. For when the Dr. at near a Weeks end called upon you for the MS. there was not so much of it Collated, as might have been done, and that leisurely too, and without making very great haste, at one Evenings sitting. But as for you and your Collator, divide the Fault between your selves upon as equal Terms as you can; though, I think, you have fairly discharg'd Mr. Gibson. That Dr. Bentley should bear the blame, is altogether unreasonable. But 'twas not Mr. Boyle's business to see Faults in their right places.*

P. 129.

We have seen here one Instance of Mr. Ben-
net's Talent at *denying* a thing *very positively*: I
cannot forbear presenting the Reader with ano-
ther of the same kind.

The Dr. had said, That when the MS. was
delivered to him, *He had not the least Suspicion,*
that the Collation was not finished. They had,
had *more days to compare it in, than they needed*
hours; the Bearer at the Delivery of it intimated
nothing to the contrary; if they had had any oc-
casion for the farther use of it, he might have
expected, upon his Return to the Library, which
was several Months before Mr. Boyle's Book was
Printed, to have heard farther from them; which
he not having done, what reason had he to
think, but that they had finished their whole
work with it?

This however was a *Circumstance*, there was a
necessity of their Denying, and that *very posi-*
tively. Which therefore Mr. Bennet has done in
the following Form of words.

With what Conscience can the Dr. pretend to
say, That when the MS. was carryed down to him
at Westminster [a little afterwards] he had no
Suspensions, that the Collation was not finished?
Unless he means, That he did not suspect it, be-
cause he most certainly knew it. GOD forgive
him this Untruth; which with several others, I
hope, before he goes out of the World, he'll be
so just, both to himself and me, as to retract pub-
lickly.

And is not this denying a thing *very positive-*
ly? Now must I crave Mr. Bennet's Pardon if I
tell him, That what he here *so positively* avers
for a *certainty*, is not only an *uncertainty*, but an
absolute Impossibility.

But

But how can that be? Will Mr. Bennet say, Doth not the *Certificate* of my *Collator* expressly confirm it? — *I very well remember* — Here we find, that when the Dr. called upon me for the MS. and I sent my Man to the *Collator's* for it, word was brought that *he had not finished the Collation*: Notwithstanding which, the Dr. *utterly refuses* to spare it any longer, but sends my Man a *second* time for it with express Orders, to have it brought to him *immediately*; himself staying in my Shop and waiting the Return of it. And that, *That was the true Reason, why Mr. Gibson could Collate no more of the Epistles. With what Conscience then* can the Dr. pretend to say, that when the MS. was sent down to him at *Westminster* (a little afterwards) he *had no Suspicions*, that the Collation was not finished? For could my *Collator* go on with collating the MS. when the MS. it self was taken out of his hands?

But hold, Mr. Bennet; you are somewhat too hasty in your Conclusions. From your own Account it appears, that it was on a *Saturday Noon*, That he called upon you for the MS. and was told, that the Collation was not *then* finished. He did not thereupon forthwith, and *immediately* take it away with him, as most certainly he would have done, had he had a *private Design of disappointing Mr. Boyle* of the use of it. He only order'd you, without fail to send it to his Lodgings *some time* that Afternoon; beyond which time he did indeed, (and he hath given a good Reason, why) *refuse* to leave it in your hands. So that you had still *half a day* good; in less time than which (as the Dr. hath proved by an *Experiment* of his own making) the *whole* Book might have been collated, though not one stroke

V. p. 124

P. 98.

Dr's pref.

stroak had been set to it before. Nor need we suppose your Collator able, to Dispatch such a piece of work altogether, as expeditiously as the Dr. since having had it in his hands for so many days before, the Dr. might reasonably then presume him nearer the end than the beginning. Nor can I imagine, but that had you represented to him the pressingness of the occasion, your Collator would have found means of borrowing from the *Press* three or four hours even of *Day-light*, to have devoted to the Service of Mr. Boyle. If the MS. was taken out of your Collators hands at Noon, and if the Dr *knew* as much (though that is more than the Dr. remembers) yet it being left in *your* hands, in *three* or four minutes space it might have been put into your Collator's again; which that it was *not*, was more than the Dr. could *certainly know*, or more than he had any reason to *suspect*. Unless he had *then* most *certainly known*, that Mr. Boyle's Solicitor would have taken no more Care of Mr. Boyle's Concerns, than he now appears to have done. So that the Dr. though he was told indeed, when he called upon you for the MS. at *Noon*, that the Collation was not *then* finished; yet having left it in your hands at *Noon*, not knowing how much of it *then* remained unfinished; nay, the Collation of the whole MS. (which is much shorter than the printed Book) being the work of less than *half a day*: Whether it were *sooner* or *later*, in the Afternoon, that the Book was sent to his Lodgings, it is *Impossible* (unless the Bearer had given him such Information) for him, to have known, that the Collation of it was not *then* finished. Nothing less, I say, than absolutely impossible, that he should *certainly have known*

known it, and most highly unreasonable had it been in him to have *suspected* it. And for a Man to averr, and that so *very positively* as Mr. Bennet here doth, for *Certainties*, not only *Uncertainties*, but *Impossibilities*, argues as great a want of common Sence as of Conscience.

Ay but, saith Mr. Bennet, here the Dr's Memory hath fail'd him as to one particular. The Dr. saith, that the MS. was not returned, nor required to be returned more *limitedly* than only *some time* that *Afternoon*. But that, saith Mr. Bennet, is *another slip* of the Dr's Memory: he demanded it out of my hands at *Noon*, and *refused me the use of it any longer*, but *order'd it to be sent to his Lodgings* out of hand, as *it was*, a *little afterwards*, *immediately* just after Dinner.

Another slip of the Dr's Memory. But this *slip of the Dr's Memory*, Sir, is a Circumstance in which he is *as positive* as you can be to the contrary. And can you give me any tolerable reason for it, why I should more depend upon *your* Memory, than upon the Dr's? In the next place, the Dr's Account of this Affair entirely agrees with your own *first* Account given us in Mr. Boyle's Book, and with the *Certificate* of your *Collator*. And how comes the. *That day* of your *first* Account to be in your *second* shortned into a *little afterwards*, *out of hand*, *immediately*, even just *after Dinner*? And in the next, let any Man of common Sense judge of the *Probability* of the thing. If the Dr. was in such mighty haste for the MS. that he must needs have it returned to him so instantly *out of hand*, *immediately*, just *after Dinner*; why did he not take it away with him himself? Or why did he not order your Man to carry it to his Lodgings *out of hand*, *immediately*,

mediately before *Dinner*, as well as *immediately* after *Dinner* ? Or, did you desire him to let your Man stay and take his *Dinner* first ? His *Victuals* would do him more good when 'twas hot.

Mr. B. Pish !

Nay, who can help it ? Is there any other way of answering such stuff as this, than by laughing at it ? Or must they go on uncontradicted, because there's no answering them without making one's Self ridiculous ?

And now let me make some few Remarks upon this terrible *Sentence*, which our *Bookseller* of the *Half-Moon* passes upon the Dr.

In the first place, this *Sentence* is pretended to be founded upon the *Certificate* of your *Collator*. But how can that *Certificate* of your *Collator* convict the Dr. of so *notorious an Untruth*, who *Denyes* nothing that is in it ? Or, must I believe the Dr. to be so grievous a *Liar*, because *Some-Body* hath lent Mr. Bennet a *Figure* in *Rhetorick*, called, *Exclamatio*, to clap into his *Appendix* against him ?

In the next place I observe, that there is nothing in this *Certificate* of your *Collator*, not fully answer'd in the Dr's Preface, saving that *new Circumstance* in your *second Account*, quite forgot to be *remembred* by you in your *first*. And to what purpose then was that *Certificate* of your *Collator* reprinted ? To none other in the world, but to keep the Cause in heart, and dazle the Eyes of your *Thoughtless Readers*, by making a shew of Hands against the Dr. And what end is there of contending with Men, who go on Printing and Prating the same baffled Stuff over and over again, and will not accept of an Answer ?

And

And Thirdly, Let any Man judge whether or no, that *new* Story of *just after Dinner*, be not a perfect Fiction of Mr. Benner's *second* Memory, altogether absurd and improbable, and framed for no other end or purpose, than to patch up a breach in their *true Story* of the MS. And yet

Fourthly, The Plaster is still too narrow for the Sore. For how did the Dr. know (as he tells you himself) when your Collator sent him word, that he had not finished the Collation indeed, but was at work upon it, that he was above two or three Pages short of the end? And if so; they might have been collated while your Man was eating his *Dinner*. And what a leaky Cause have you got in hand? The more 'tis patch'd, the more it draws water. But a rotten Bottom will not bear mending.

And now upon the whole, let the Reader once more look upon that peremptory Sentence which this Bookseller passes upon the Dr. his, *with what Conscience then*, and, *GOD forgive him this Untruth*; and make what Reflections he pleases. These Gentlemen of the *Half-Moon* may go on with their printing things upon the Dr. as long as they pleased; but they must not expect to be much longer believed for their *bold speaking*.

But admitting your *Postulatum*; suppose that the Dr. had most certainly *known*, that when the MS. was returned to him the Collation was not finished? What then?

Why, was not the Dr. a very *uncivil* Man then, in forcing the Book out of our hands, and that though he *knew* the Collation was not finished, and consequently, could not but *know* what a *Disappointment* his refusing to let us keep it any longer would be to Mr. Boyle? And was not the Dr. a very *uncivil* Man then? Not

Not at all, Sir. For the Question is not, whether the Collation was finished, or *not* finished, when he called in the MS. and refused to leave it with you any longer; nor whether the Dr. *knew*, or *not* knew as much: but whether he did not, *as soon as it* came to be in his *Power*, *voluntarily* supply you with the use of it; whether or no you had it not in your hands long enough to have collated it over and over, and by whose Fault it was, that the Collation was not finished before the MS. was called in; whether or no he had not some *other* Reason for his calling it in when he did, than a *Design* of *disappointing* Mr. Boyle of the use of it; and whether or no his refusing at *that time* to leave it in your hands *any longer*, ought in Reason to have been interpreted as want of Respect to a person of that honourable Name and Quality. These are the Queries to which you ought to give a more satisfactory Answer, than I have yet met with, ere you will be able to justify the Clamours you have raised upon the Dr. for his refusing you at *that time* the *farther use* of the MS. Mr. Boyle himself is pleased to acknowledge, that when the Dr. came to demand the MS. of Mr. Bennet again, he *then* (no, not before; that was *very positively* to be denied; but *he then*) told him, *That he was to go into the Country, and gave that for his Reason, why he could allow him no more time to collate it in.* And a very good Reason, I think, it was. But what saith Mr. Boyle himself to it? *It was a mighty Treasure, it seems; the Credit of the King's Library depended upon the Alexandrian MS. and That; and therefore he would not Trust it out of those Walls one day longer.* And here's a Flourish for you, and that's all. One day

P. 20.

Ibid.

day longer ! No, Sir ; not *one day* longer, but some *Months* longer ; passing from hand to hand, and not without Danger of miscarriage. I would seriously ask Mr. *Boyle*, and let his own Thoughts make the Answer ; ought the Dr. to have left the Library for so many *Months* together, without seeing the MS. returned into it before he went ? Would he himself, had he been in the Dr's place, have ran such a risk ? Why then, doth he fall so foul upon the Dr. for doing That which in the Dr's place, no Man would not have done ? The *Trusting* the MS. out of *those Walls* at all, was somewhat adventurously done of the Dr. and ought not to have been received for so *Common* a Favour ; the calling it in again upon the occasion he did, would not, I *dare say*, have been *resented* by any Man in *England*, save Mr. *Boyle*, as an Affront ; nor, to deal plainly with him, by him neither, but that he was resolved to pick a Quarrel with the Dr. and wanted a better Pre-
tence.

There was no need therefore of the Dr's inventing that Story, *That when the MS. was delivered to him, he had not the least Suspicion, but that the Collation was finished.* His Reply to Mr. *Boyle*, had been sufficient without it. That as soon as it was in his Power, he *voluntarily* supply'd them with the use of it ; that they had it in their hands, more *days* than the collating of it requir'd *hours* ; that when at near a *Weeks* end (and the whole was not the work of half a day) he called upon them to have it restored, he could not have expected to have found the Collation unfinished ; that he was not *then* at the Liberty of sparing it them *any longer* ; but that they might have had it again for asking. This
had

had been Answer enough of all Conscience to the *Passage in Mr. Boyle's Preface*. There was no need therefore of the Dr's having recourse to Fiction, when he had Truth enough to have served his turn. But though there was no necessity of the Dr's feigning this Story, if it had been really true; yet *Mr. Boyle* being resolved to stand to what he had done, there was a necessity of his denying it, and that as Authentically as possible. And the Dr. having in his Preface shewn, that *Mr. Boyle's* Evidences were nothing to the purpose, a necessity also there was for *Mr. Bennet's*, in his *Appendix*, betaking himself to his *Recollecting* Faculty, and starting up that new Circumstance. Upon which, I shall only make this short Reflection; that if the Dr. feigned this Story, he is one of those Men who delight to tell Lyes to no manner of purpose: But upon *Mr. Bennet*, as to this particular, I cannot pass the same Censure. If this *after* Story of just *after-Dinner* be a Lye, as I verily believe it is; I can not say as the Dr. upon alike occasion did; that 'tis a Silly one: No, 'twas a Necessary one, and the only Refuge he had left him.

Well, saith the Dr. and suppose the Collation was not finished, when the MS. was delivered to me, could they not upon my Return to the Library, which was several Months before *Mr. Boyle's* Book was Printed, have asked me for it again?

To this by way of Answer they return a parcel of words; and nothing but words.

P. 98. The Dr. saith *Mr. Bennet*, gave me not the least Hopes, that if applyed to him upon his Return out of the Country, I should have leave to get the Collation finished.

That

That is, the Dr. did not *bid* you borrow the Book of him again. As why should he, when he thought you had done your whole work with it?

And besides, Mr. Boyle had given me no Or- P. 131.
der to make a fresh Application to him.

But why not?

Because I had given him an Account of the Dr's parting Civilities.

Very well; we shall see by and by, who set the *Christ-Church* Men upon Dr. Bentley.

But what saith Mr. Boyle himself to it? Yes, P. 21.
I could (have asked for it again) and have been denied it again, which I was not very willing to venture. I neither thought my self so little, nor Dr. Bentley so Great, nor the MS. so considerable, That I should make a Second Application for it, after such a Repulse; no, not though I had been sure of obtaining it; much less could I ever think of asking it again, when, by what Mr. Bennet had told me, I had all the Reason in the world to believe I should be again denied it.

Handsome English, I confess, and Majestically delivered; but false Suggestion all over. If you thought your self too Great to ask the Favour, with what Conscience can you complain of a Denial? Your second Application (if an Application so widely made may be called yours) was altogether as necessary as your first; and as you received no Repulse in the one, you might have promised your self the like Success in the other. Your not vouchsafing to renew your Request, nay, or so much as to signify your Desire, and yet proclaiming your self in Print denied the farther use of it, is an Action which all the Phrase in the world cannot excuse from being unjust.

N

Nay,

Nay, and after all, suppose the Dr. had absolutely refused to lend them the MS. at all : Suppose (as a Man *less obliging* than himself would have done) he had cut off Mr. Bennet with this short Answer : " Mr. Boyle is a Person known to me only by the name of his Family, a Name for which I have the greatest Veneration ; but I wonder that Mr. Boyle should understand things no better, than to think, that it lyes in my Power to part with a MS. out of the King's Library without some better Warrant for it, than-barely a young Oxford Scholar's sending his Bookseller to demand it of me. Suppose, I say, the Dr. had given such an Answer, and thereupon Mr. Bennet had sent his Letter of Complaint to *Christ-Church* : Mr. Boyle might indeed have interpreted it as a kind of Re-primand to himself, for his being a little too *uncourtly* in his *Applications* : but durst he thereupon have printed a Book upon the Dr. ? Durst he have Libell'd and Posted his Majesty's *Library-Keeper*, for keeping to the Rules of his Office, and refusing to be at the Command, I will not say of Mr. Boyle himself, but of Mr. Boyle's Bookseller ? Or could the bare *Denial* of a *Favour*, have justified such a kind of Retaliation ; a *Favour*, according to the methods Mr. Boyle took of obtaining it, so unreasonable to be expected ? A *Favour* so carelessly, so coldly, so superficially asked, that the not receiving it could scarce deserve the Name of a *Denial*. I shall not scruple therefore to say, how much soever a Paradox it may seem to those who have been so artificially possess'd with the contrary Story, That Dr. Bentley was *obliging* even to an Excess to a Person, who neither knew how

how to request a Favour like a *Gentleman*, not (as the Event hath proved) to requite it but with Injuries. I had not allow'd my self this Freedom of Speech with a person of his Quality, had not he himself been pleas'd to accumulate his *first* Act of Unjustice, by a greater one of defending it; not only by suffering his *Popular* Name to stand in the Frontispiece of so wretched a Libel as is that I have been considering, but also by persisting to patronize this *Lazy, Sawcy Bookseller* of his, who begun that unhappy Quarrel, with which neither of the Parties have much cause to be satisfied, but which, without the Spirit of Prophecy, I dare adventure to foretel them, when they have done their worst, will end little to the advantage of the Aggressor.

And what doth Mr. Boyle mean by his *so common a Favour*? Are therefore MSS. so *Common* Ware? Is the Loan of a MS. out of any Library; out of the *King's* Library, so *common a Favour*? The Learned and Reverend Dr. Mill Dr. B's found it otherwise in the time of Dr. Bentley's prof. p. Predecessor; the great *Selden* found it otherwise, Dr. Burnet's Life when he wanted the use of a MS. out of the *Bodleian* Library: And otherwise, I presume, of Sir Matthew Hales. would Mr. Boyle himself have found it, had a person *less obliging* than Dr. Bentley been in possession of the Key; and otherwise, perhaps, would *another* person than Mr. Boyle have found it even from Dr. Bentley himself. But the Dr. was resolved to trespass even a little beyond his Line, rather than not *oblige* a person of that honourable Name; for which the requital he hath received will perhaps for the future make such Favours *less common*, and render it a *greater Difficulty* to obtain a MS. out of the Royal Library,

Mr. B.
p. 14.

than just sending one's Bookseller to the *Library Keeper*, to tell him, that such a one wants such a Book out of the *Library*, which upon pain of being Lampoon'd in Print, he must forthwith deliver to the Bearer. Either the *Library-Keeper* must be *less obliging* than Mr. Boyle would have him, or what between Mr. Boyle's *Learned Foreigners*, and the *Christ-Church* Editors, the *Library* will soon be naked of its *Manuscripts*.

And now I cannot but by way of Recapitulation observe to the Reader, how often they are forced to double tell their Stories.

The *Library-Keeper* of St. James's, *uncivil* Man as he was! 'Twas not till after *nine Months Solicitation* that we could procure so *common* a Favour as the Loan of a MS. out of the King's *Library*. (Mr. Boyle's Book, and Mr. Bennet's *first Account*.)

How can that be, saith the Dr. That *Library-Keeper* you speak of was not so much as *one Month*, no, not *half* a *Month Library-Keeper*, before he *voluntarily* came and offered it (Dr. B's Preface.)

Who says he was *Library-Keeper* all that while? But he liv'd near the Royal Library, he was acquainted with those worthy Gentlemen that then had the keeping of the Key, and bore them Company sometimes when they went into the Library. (Mr. Bennet's *second Account*.)

The *Library Keeper* at St. James's denied a person of Mr. Boyle's Quality so *common* a Favour as the use of one of the King's MS. (Their *first Account*.)

How could I *lend* them the MS. before it was in my *Power* to *lend* it them? (The Dr's. Preface.)

Who

Who says, you could have *lent* it us much sooner than you did? But you might have got it to be *lent* to us. (Mr. Bennet's second Account.)

'Twas not without *great Difficulties*, that we at *last* procured the MS. nor till after a *long Solicitation*. (Mr. Bennet's first Account.)

What doth this Man mean by his *great Difficulties*? The *greatest Difficulty* that ever I put him too was that of sending his Man to fetch it. *Solicitation*! One would imagine that he had worn out the Streets with frequent Journeys to solicit for the MS. I don't remember that either he or his Apprentice came once to my Lodgings, or to the Library for it, till the time that he sent for't by my Appointment, and received it. (Dr. B's Preface.)

Who says, I did? That was not my way of *Soliciting*, to take *Journeys*. But I spake to you of it I know not how many times as you came in my way, and either *stept into my Shop*, or *pass'd by the Door*. *Twenty times at least*. (Mr. Bennet's second Account.)

He took the MS. out of our hands before the *Collation* was finished, and though he was told as much, yet he *utterly refused* to leave it with us *any longer*, but demanded to have it sent to his Lodgings *that very day* (Mr. Bennet's first Account.)

True: For I was obliged to see it returned into the Library *that very day*. But 'twas according to your own Account at *Noon*, that I called upon you for the MS. and was told that *Collation* was not *then* finished. I had not the least *Suspicion*, but that when it was delivered to me, the whole was then collated. (Dr. B Preface.)

Oh! This *Liar*! Not the *least Suspicion*! He *most certainly knew* the contrary? My Collator expressly sent him word, that he had not finished the Collation.

Ay, but that was *Noon*, I did not (even according to your own Account) forthwith and *immediately* take it away with me; I left it in your hands, only ordering you to send it after me some time that *Afternoon* without fail; and the whole might have been collated twice over in half a day.

Oh abominable!

Why that's all you your self say, in your *first* Account. That I refused to spare it you *any longer*, that is, *any longer* than *that day*: which is true; for that *Evening* is part of *that Day*.

That *Evening*! Oh this wicked Man? Well; God forgive him. He commanded me to send it to his Lodgings *forthwith*, *out of hand*, *immediately*, just after *Dinner*; I protest. And he says, not till the close of the *Evening*. God forgive him *this untruth*.

Why, Sir, time was when you your self said no more. (Mr. Bennet's *first* Account.)

Ay, but when I saw the Dr's Preface, I presently *recollected* the matter a little better. 'Twas just after *Dinner*, I *sincerely declare*. (Mr. Bennet's *second* Account.)

But doth not a Cause look very suspiciously, that is always changing its Colours thus? Hath *Sincerity* so mutable a Face?

And thus much for this *tedious Story* of the MS. that *Matter of Fact* with their Flourishes upon which the *Terræ filius's* of the *Half-Moon* have raised such *Huzzas* upon the *Library-Keeper* at St. James's. There is not, I think, any material

material Circumstance in the whole, upon which I have not bestow'd as much (and I fear more) Consideration as it deserves. And as for the *Silly* Suggestions with which Mr. Bennet hath stuff'd out every Page of his *Appendix*, to have answered them more particularly, had been an Impertinence almost as inexcusable as that of writing them. I have endeavour'd to set things in a *clear Light*, and disrobe them of those *false Colours*, with which Mr. Bennet, and his honourable Friend have *extremely disguised* them. As I go all along only upon the bottom of their own Prints, and as I have no where represented the matter otherwise, than exactly according to my own Apprehension concerning it: So I cannot but perswade my self, that any Man who shall give himself the trouble of comparing their Accounts will fall in with me in the same Opinion; that throughout this whole *Phalaridan* Controversie, the *Learning*, the *Civility*, *Vindictive* and the *Veracity* are all on a side.

Having dispatch'd this grand Affair, the *Matter of Fact*, I might now think my work at an end with Mr. Bennet and his *Appendix*. Some few *straggling* Calumnies however there are here and there intermixed with his *faithful Relations*, which to pass over altogether unobserved might still leave the Reader under the Opinion, that there are in this *Appendix* of Mr. Bennet's at least one or two *Truths*: Especially when he finds them not only so confidently averr'd, but some of them also, to appearance, so firmly attested.

For this is one of the methods by which the *Gentlemen* of the *Half-Moon* so successfully carry on their Controversie with the Dr. They pro-

cure a number of Hands, and Depositions against him. This serves to set a Gloss upon the Cause, and put's off the most false and foolish Suggestions with an appearance of Certainty. Mr. Boyle is somewhat merciful in this kind, and contents himself with the Testimonies of three

P. 9.

Witnesses ; but those Persons of Probity and Worth, he tells us, (as much as to say, not like Dr. Bentley) and such whose word he doubts not will be much sooner credited than the Dr's. Thomas Bennet, Bookseller, at the Sign of the Half-Moon in S. Pauls Church-Yard ; GEO. Gibson, Thomas Bennet's Collator ; and William King, J. C. D. of the Commons. But Mr. Bennet himself is more plentiful in his Evidences.

P. 101:

107.

124. 128.

119:

134:

Two Letters from the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq; two Certificates of GEO. Gibson, Collator ; another from Nich. Hooper, Beadle to the Company of Stationers ; another from John Crooke, Bookseller ; a Letter from the Learned and Honourable Sir Edw. Sherburne ; another from the aforesaid Will. King, of the Commons ; and another (Soldier-like, the strongest in the Rear) from Sir W. Temple ; nay, and amongst the rest something out of a Letter of the Dr's own Hand-writing given in in Evidence against himself.

P. 120:

And these are Mr. Bennet's Evidences ; a formidable appearance, and, by a Name or two, too many ; whom I am heartily sorry to see joyned in so foul a Cause, and so unequally match'd. But as we are upon a Tryal of Fact, I may, I hope, without trespassing upon the Respects due to their Persons examine into the Validity of their Testimonies, and enquire how far they will serve the Ends for which Mr. Bennet produces them. For who will think the Cause determined, unless the Witnesses are heard ?

To begin with the two Letters of Mr. Boyle, in the first of which he Charges the Dr. with *Falshood*, in the other with *Radeness*.

Mr. Boyle's first Letter, p. 101.

Mr. Benner,

I am glad you had the good Fortune to preserve any of my Letters relating to the Manuscript Phalaris in St. James's Library. — I am as fully satisfied of the Truth of what You have said upon that Occasion, as I am of the Falshood of what Dr. Bentley hath said upon That, and several others.

It may be counted an *Uncivil* thing in me, to disturb Mr. Boyle's *Satisfactions*; but since he is for so plain *English*, I must as plainly tell him, That *what Dr. Bentley hath said upon that Occasion* is most undoubtedly *True*. For the *Occasion* Mr. Boyle is here speaking of, is that *false Account of Mr. Benner's*, Printed in Mr. Boyle's admired *Phrase-Book* upon the *Library-Keeper at St. James's*, concerning the *nine Months Solicitation*. In answer to which Dr. Bentley in his *Preface* hath said (nor hath he said it only, but *prov'd* it also) that that *uncivil Library-Keeper Mr. Boyle's* whole Book runs so hard upon, was not so much as *one Month Keeper of the Library at St. James's* before he supplied Mr. Benner with the MS. for the use of Mr. Boyle: And that as for that *Solicitation* Mr. Benner speaks of, with all his *Soliciting*, he never so much as once gave himself the trouble of going or sending to the Dr's Lodgings upon Mr. Boyle's Concerns, saving that one time, when by the Dr's *own Appointment*, he sent his Man to the Library for the Book, and received it. This is all the Dr. hath said upon *that Occasion*; and both these things

are

are most certain, confessed, and undeniable *Truths*. As for that *after* Distinction of Mr. *Bennet's* in his *Appendix* between the *Library-Keeper* at *St. James's*, and a *Nigh-dweller* to the *Library*, and that *after* Explication of the word *Sollicitation*, that he did not mean giving himself the labour of taking *Journeys*, or any other *trouble* whatsoever, but barely the speaking to the *Dr.* of it *Occasionally*, and as he chanc'd to fall in his way: these *after* Emendations of the *Story*, I say, in Mr. *Bennet's* *second* Account the *Dr.* could not answer before Mr. *Bennet* had conceived them. I again therefore, after the *Dr.* affirm it; that Mr. *Bennet's* *first* Account, in Justification of which Mr. *Boyle* here appears, is (at least as 'tis managed in Mr. *Boyle's* Book) a *false* Account, at least a foul, partial, and disguised Account; and being so contrived on purpose to *mislead the* *Reader*, and that not in a *Trifling*, but in the *very Principal* Circumstances of the *Fact*, to which it belongs; it may very justly be called a *false* Account, as directly designing to create in the *Reader* a *false* Opinion. And such most plainly and undeniably it is. I might also observe, that could Mr. *Boyle* have produced a Copy of any Letter of his *own*, written to the *Dr.* *himself* upon the *Occasion* of the *Manuscript* *Phalaris* at *St. James's*, it had been much more to the purpose than his referring us to Mr. *Bennet's* *File*. I might also *Query*, how early doth the name of *Dr. Bentley* appear upon Mr. *Bennet's* *File*? What? *nine Months* before they had the *MS.* But all this we have had over before *Sup. p. 147. 151.* And thus much for the Evidence of Mr. *Boyle's* *first* Letter. No, Sir; what *Dr. Bentley* hath said upon that *Occasion* is not a *Falshood*, but an undeniable

deniable *Truth*. But I cannot leave this first Letter without one Remark upon Mr. Boyle's very cautious way of expressing himself. I am *as fully satisfied*, says he, *of the Truth of Mr. Bennet's Account, as I am of the Falshood of Dr. Bentley's*. Now, with the Gentleman's good leave, I would ask him, what this amounts to ? I my self and every Man in *England*, are *as fully satisfied* of the one, *as* of the other ; and yet Mr. Boyle must not infer from hence, that we are at all satisfied of either of them : I am *as fully satisfied*, that Mr. Boyle writ the late Defence of *Phalaris*, *as* I am that Mr. Bennet writ the Appendix *that he has set his hand to*. This I can truly say I am *fully satisfied in* ; and yet notwithstanding this *full satisfaction*, I have some Scruples concerning the true Author of that Defence of *Phalaris* ; especially when I consider this very Letter, and a certain Copy of Verses before the *Dispensary*.

Mr. Boyle's second Letter, p. 107.

I am almost *asham'd* to trouble you any more, Mr. Bennet, about the MS. I wish, I had it : But, if at all, I must have it very quickly. And though I can do pretty well without it, yet Dr. Bentley's Rudeness is not the less.

And here's another Complement upon the Dr. Dr. Bentley's Rudeness. But wherein consisted this Rudeness of the Dr's ? Mr. Bennet hath been pleased in the words immediately following to explain it. *A little before this, it seems, I had given Mr. Boyle an Account of Dr. Bentley's disobliging Delays and Expressions*. The Rudeness therefore, here complained of consisted in ; First his *Disobliging Delays*, and Secondly, his *Disobliging Expressions*.

And

And first as to his disobliging *Delays*. Now this *Letter* of Mr. Boyle's was dated, Oxford, May 1st. when the Dr. was not yet actually entered upon the Possession of his Office. And that Information which Mr. Bennet had sent down to *Christ-Church* against the Dr. was drawn up some time before. So that the disobliging *Delays* of which Mr. Bennet had been making his Complaints to Mr. Boyle, were the Dr's not *Lending* them the MS. before it was in his Power to lend it them: Of which enough already.

But here might I ask Mr. Bennet a Question or two. 'Twas not you say till after *nine Months* Solicitation, that you *at last* obtained the use of the MS. Nor till after at least *twenty* times asking for it. But why did you not after your having been *one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight* Months *delay'd* by the Dr. try some other methods? Why did you not after having been *once, twice, thrice, twenty times* disappointed by the Dr. make some Enquiry where the matter stuck? This had been the part of a faithful *Solicitor*, and had prevented this unhappy Controversie in its Original. And a little Enquiry would have inform'd you, where the Key of the Library was lodg'd for the greatest part of those *nine Months*, and who had been the proper Persons to whom to have made your Application. If therefore you did *not* know the then State of the Royal Library, it must have been for want of Enquiry, and a Proof of your Sloth and Indifference as to Mr. Boyle's Concerns. If you *did* know it, and yet wrote such a Letter to Mr. Boyle against the Dr. what can we call it but a delight in doing mischief? But I have Charity enough to impute it to the former; your *Lazi-*

ness only. For 'twas an easier thing to sit still behind the Counter and write *Letters* to Mr. Boyle, than to take *Journeys*, and run from *Pauls-Church-Yard* to *Westminster* a borrowing the Book for him your self. Your Letter, to which this of Mr. Boyle's is an Answer, was written, you tell us, probably, *in the very latter end of April*: But a Letter then written, to have given a fair Account of the matter; should have been to this purpose. "I have spoken to Dr. Bentley several times about the MS. and he hath faithfully promised to *help me to it*: But his Patient hath not yet pass'd all its Formalities, so that he is not as yet possess'd of the Key of the Library; But hopes within a short time to be so. And then we shall take Care to answer your Expectations. Though by the bye, as I have been speaking to him of the MS. I have heard him now and then pass an untoward kind of Censure upon your Author. 'Tis a *Spurious and contemptible* piece, he says, and not worthy of a new Edition, and thinks, as I have sometimes heard him say, you might better bestow your time than in throwing it away upon such an unedifying undertaking. Had Mr. Bennet written such a Letter as this, it had been a fair Account, nor could Mr. Boyle have justly taken offence at it: And if he wrote more than this, I very confidently presume he was a *false* Informer. For,

Secondly, what can we reasonable suppose to have been these *disobliging Expressions* the Dr. us'd concerning Mr. Boyle. The Dr. was at that time a perfect Stranger to Mr. Boyle and his Qualities, and Mr. Boyle the same to the Dr. It cannot therefore have been any personal Pique against

against him, and sure he cannot have despised him for the sake of his *Name*. What then can have been these *disobliging Expressions*? None other, I dare say, than what I have been just now touching upon; the Censure the Dr. may have pass'd upon not Mr. Boyle's person, but his Author; and so Mr. Benner himself, both in this very Page (107.) and in his *first* Account is pleas'd to explain it. The many *slight and injurious things* Dr. Bentley threw out now and then, both upon him (Mr. Boyle) and the Work he was about: and, the Reflections the Dr. made from time to time, when I spake to him from Mr. Boyle for the use of the MS. (p. 99.) And after the same manner is the matter reported in the Depositions of Dr. King. These Reflections therefore all along terminate upon him, with regard to the *Work he was about*, the collating of MSS. and the Editing of a *spurious and contemptible* Author: A Character, which had the Dr. been asked his Opinion, I presume, he would have given it to this mock *Phalaris*, whether Mr. Boyle had been put upon a new Edition of him or not. And if the Dr. may perhaps have yet further reflected upon the *Collating* of MSS. and the new *Editing*, and translating of *Greek Books* (a Work requiring a maturity of Judgment, and a Palate by long use habituated to the Niceties of the Learned Languages) as an improper Employment for young Students to begin the first Essays of their Pens upon: neither doth *this* stick upon Mr. Boyle, but where 'twas placed, the *Directors* and *Coadjutors* of his Studies; who cannot but be thought to have merited some kind of blame, first for their having put that young Gentleman upon a Work somewhat above his

Mr. B's
pref. p. 2.

Ap. 131.

Mr. B. p.

then Capacity; and Secondly, for affording him so slender an Assistance in it: nor is the Scholar answerable for the mistaken methods of his Teachers. And for a Man either to feign an Affront where there is none given, or to aggravate things beyond measure, only to execute the Revenges of a party, or to expose to the World his Stock of *Phrase* and Witticisms, is as *ungentleman like* an use of the Pen, as picking Quarrels in the Streets is of the Sword.

And thus much for Mr. Bennet's two first Testimonies against the Dr, these two Letters from Mr. Boyle, the *Falshood* charged upon him in the former, and the *Rudeness* in the latter. I might indeed have spared my self the Labour of answering them so particularly: it had been sufficient to have excepted against Mr. Boyle, as too much a Party in this Cause to be admitted for an Evidence. I might withal take occasion to remind the Reader of what is somewhere before hinted to him; that we are not now any longer to seek, who 'twas that began this unhappy Contest, and first set the *Christ-Church* Men upon Dr. Bentley. For I cannot yet see, what necessity there was for Mr. Bennet's informing Mr. Boyle of the Dr's *disobliging Expressions*; whatever they were, as well as his *disobliging Delays*. Let Mr. Bennet write it over his Door, *Quid de quoque viro, & cui dicas, sæpe caveto*, Sup. p. 144.

The two *Certificates* of the Collator, I very *Sup. p.* very well remember, and, I do declare, That—another considerable part of Mr. Bennet's Evidence against the Dr. have been already considered.

Here follows another *Certificate* against the Dr.

This

This is to Certifie, That Phalaris's Epistles, in Greek and Latin, put out by the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esquire, were Printed by me at my own Cost and Charges; and neither Mr. Bennet, nor any other Bookseller was any ways concerned in it. As soon as the Book was Printed, I sold near the whole Impression to Mr. Crofsly Bookseller in Oxon. Witness my Hand

JOHN CROOKE.

P. 36.

This Certificate of Mr. Crooke is produced to prove another *Untruth* upon the Dr. upon Account of a certain passage in his Preface given in these words. *The Bookseller once asked me privately, that I would do him the Favour to tell my Opinion, if the new Edition of Phalaris then in the Press would be a vendible Book, telling me that he was concerned in the Impression, and hop'd it would sell well. To which the Dr. reply'd, That as for the Sale of the Book, he need not question it; the great Names of those that recommended it would get it many Buyers. But however, under the Rose, the Book was a spurious piece, and deserved not to be spread in the World by another Impression. This private Discourse Mr. Bennet betrays to the Christ-Church Editors: And what follows upon that every Body knows. And good reason for it; must the methods of a Learned Society be reflected upon? Must Book-sellers be whisper'd in the Ear, That——— puts his young Men upon Printing, *spurious* Books? *Hinc illa Lachrymæ!* And this the Dr. declares is all the Reflection he made to the disadvantage of Mr. Boyle.*

This

This Discourse between himself and Mr. Bennet the Dr. very well remembers. But here again Mr. Bennet is very positive to the contrary. P. 118.
I utterly deny, saith he, That ever I spake a Syllable to him tending that way, and 'tis improbable to the highest degree that ever I should. And so comes in Mr. Crooke's Certificate, to shew, That the Book was Printed altogether at another Man's Cost and Charges, and near the whole Impression, when finished, Sold to Mr. Crofsley Bookseller in Oxford; from him had Mr. Bennet fifty Books at first; and a few more, some years afterwards, from another hand; but in the whole a far less number than he commonly uses of any Oxford Impression: Therefore there can have been no such Discourse between him and the Dr. as that, *He should have asked the Dr's Opinion concerning the Book, whether he thought it would be a vendible piece, and that he should tell the Dr. That he had a Concern in the Impression, and hop'd it would Sell well.* I utterly deny, that ever I spake a Syllable to him tending this way, and 'tis improbable to the highest degree that ever I should.

But in the first place, that Mr. Bennet should have had so very frequent occasions to Discourse with the Dr. about the Epistles of *Phalaris* when they were in the Press, and yet never have asked him his Opinion concerning them; that Mr. Bennet, I say, during his nine Months Solicitation for the Manuscript-*Phalaris*, and in all the at least twenty times asking him for it; yet all this while should never so much as once speak one Syllable to him tending towards the learning his Opinion concerning the Book: This, to my Apprehension, is improbable, even to the highest Degree. The Dr. was pleased to consult Mr. Bennet some times in

his way of a Bookseller : And is it not somewhat strange that Mr. Bennet should never have taken his turn of consulting the Dr. sometimes in *his way of a Scholar*. This was an Omission scarce any Bookseller in *England*, besides Mr. Bennet, would have been guilty of. And *this* is the Circumstance upon which the very stress of the Dr's Relation depends, Mr. Bennet's asking him his *Opinion concerning the Book* ; for 'twas that part of the Discourse occasioned the Dr's passing that *Reflection* upon Mr. Boyle's undertaking. Whether Mr. Bennet told the Dr. that he *was concerned in the Impression* or not, and that therefore he hoped, *it would Sell well*, is little material. Upon which I must take the Liberty of repeating Mr. Bennet's own words upon this very occasion. If the Dr. invented these little *Unnecessary* Circumstances, we must believe him to be out of his Wits, and that he loves to tell Lyes to no manner of purpose, and when 'tis in every Bodies Power to trace him.

P. 120:

But Secondly, was Mr. Bennet never concerned in the Sale of a Book, and interested to wish it might prove a *vendible* Commodity, which was altogether Printed at the Cost and Charges of another man? The Book was Printed at the sole Cost of Mr. Crooke, and yet Mr. Crossley ventured to take off *near the whole Impression*. And may not Mr. Bennet himself have had some such Design in his Head? And may not that have been the meaning of his asking the Dr's *Opinion* concerning the Book? And may he not thereupon have mentioned his *Hopes* of its proving a *saleable* piece? And may not that indifferent Character the Dr. gave him of the Book have made him more wary how he over-loaded himself

self with Copies of it, and have prov'd the occasion of his *using a fewer number of them* than he commonly doth of other Oxford Impressions? And what signifies it, whether he said in exprefs and direct Terms, *I am concerned in the Impression*, or, *I think I shall be concerned in it*, or, *I would be concerned in it*, if I had but good Hopes, it would prove a *vendible Book*? May not Mr. Bennet as well have exprefs'd himself losely in *any* one or other of these, or such like Terms, as the Dr. hath related it in *one* of them? And what difference doth this make as to the substance of the thing, and the occasion for which the Dr. produces it? I can only *Query* Mr. Bennet upon this Head. There is not, I think, in any of these things an *utter Improbability*. But that Mr. Bennet should never have spoken *one Syllable* tending towards his asking the Dr's *Opinion concerning the Book*, which is the Clause upon which the whole stress of the Dr's Allegation depends, and which Mr. Bennet *utterly denies*; this certainly every Man must look upon as an *utter Improbability*. And as to *that*, Sir, upon which all depends, Mr. Crooke's Certificate speaks not a word. This Evidence therefore, I think, we may dismiss as frivolous and insignificant. And notwithstanding Mr. Bennet's *utterly* denying it; yet I shall believe the Dr's contrary Affirmation, That Mr. Bennet *did*, sometime or other *ask the Dr's Opinion concerning the Book*; which occasioned the Dr's *Reflection* upon Mr. Boyle, and the Work he was about.

Next after this Certificate of Mr. Crooke, Mr. *P. 123.* Bennet gives in the date of a certain Letter of the Dr's own Hand-writing in Evidence against himself: by the help of which, with a more
O 2 than

than ordinary Assurance he borrows a *Phrase* of two of the Dr's own to call him *Liar* in: nay, and desires the Reader, who is not capable of examining the *Learned part of the Controversie*, to judge of That by the most palpable Errors the Dr. is guilty of in plain matter of Fact; nay, and to place the matter beyond doubt, he tells us, that we shall in time have the Letter its self Printed at large, and the Dr. confounded by the words of his *own* mouth.

P. 121.

And who would imagine now, to take my turn of borrowing a *Phrase* from Mr. Bennet, but that a matter of Fact which he is so full of, should really be as he has represented it? The Case indeed is somewhat puzzled, and would have appeared more so, but that Mr. Bennet, I thank him, hath been at some Pains to unravel it, and in the same breath he accuses the Dr. to acquit him.

In the Dr's Preface is this passage, p. 5, 6. *The first time I saw Mr. Boyle's new Phalaris, was in the hands of a Person of Honour, to whom it had been presented, and the rest of the Impression was not yet published. This encouraged me to write that very same Evening to Mr. Boyle at Oxford, and to give him a true Information of the whole matter; expecting that upon the Receipt of my Letter, he would put a stop to the Publication of the Book, till he had alter'd that passage, and Printed the page anew, which he might have done in the space of one day, and at the Charge of five Shillings.*

This the Dr. mentions as an Aggravation of Mr. Boyle's injustice, that he would not alter that passage in his Preface, though he had time notice given him, how he had been imposed up

on by the Misrepresentations of his Bookseller, and might have stop'd the farther spreading of that injurious Reflection; the Impression being not yet dispersed.

Now, saith Mr. Bennet, this Story of the Dr's I shall demonstrate to be a most notorious Falshood by one of those Notes of time, which the Dr himself well observes to be the truest and surest Helps towards detecting Impostures. The Dr. pretends in this Letter, to have given Mr. Boyle notice *timely enough, to have altered that passage, and stop'd the Books in the Printing-house.* Now, saith Mr. Bennet, this Letter, which is still preserved, bears Date Jan. 26th. 1693. a good while before which Mr. Boyle's Book was certainly Published, and publickly sold in Oxford, London, and other places. The first of that Month above one hundred of them were dispersed in Christ-Church, according to a Custom which Dr. Bentley appears to be no stranger to; and in the twenty five days between this and the Date of the Letter they were distributed into all the Booksellers hands that deal that way. And yet Dr Bentley would have the World believe, that he writ so early, that Mr. Boyle might have stop'd the Books in the Printing-house.

I answer: The Dr. did know, that a good quantity of them were dispersed in Christ-Church, and 'twas probably, one of those New years Gifts that he saw in the hands of that person of Honour: But the rest of the Impression either was not published, or not so published as for the Dr. to know it. You say, they were distributed into all the Booksellers hands that deal that way? I deny it? where are your Proofs? Here you ought to have come in with your Certificates. I do

not *believe* that the Books were publickly Sold in the Shops till some time *after* the *Date* of this Letter. If otherwise, the Dr. must have been not only a *Lyar*, but a *Fool*; to desire the Books to be stop'd *in the* Printing-house, when yet he *knew*, they were all got *out* of the Printing-house. Or how, and in what manner was the Book so published, as that the Dr. should not know of the Publication? *Query*, in which of the publick Prints was the Publication of *Phalaris's* Epistles first *Advertized*? And when? was it before *Jan. 26th. 1694*? If not, what Proof have we that the Book was published before? *Query*, were the Copies so dispersed, as that Mr. *Boyle*, had he been minded to do Justice, might not have printed one Page anew, and altered that passage in the Preface? If not, then Mr. *Boyle* had notice *early* enough to have done it. Mr. *Bennet* hath these words upon the Dr.

F. 122.

Indeed not only the Date, but the whole Course of the Letter is an evident Proof, that Dr. Bentley, when he writ it, could have no such aim in his Eye as he pretends.

Query, What Aim could he have then? The Letter was written *on purpose* to desire Mr. *Boyle* to stop the Books in the Printing-house; and yet the Dr. had no such Aim in his Eye. This I cannot understand.

Ibid.

Why, that Letter all runs upon the Supposal, that the Affront had been publickly given, and was past recall.

Monsters! The Dr. writes a Letter to Mr. *Boyle*, the very Subject of which, was to desire that Gentleman to recall the Affront: And yet all that Letter runs upon the Supposal, that the Affront was past recall. These are Inconsistencies, which

which if Mr. Bennet cannot reconcile, I dare say, No Body else can. I can say no more to this Affair, but that you are wanting in your Proofs: We have nothing but your bare word for it, that the Book was certainly Published and Sold publickly in Oxford, London, and other places before Jan. 26. Which till I shall see in what publick Prints the Publication of it was advertiz'd, I shall not be able to believe. Is it to be imagin'd, that the Dr. should have written a Letter to desire the stopping of the Books in the Printing-house, when yet he knew, that before his writing that Letter, they were all got out of the Printing-house? So that after all that Assurance, with which you deliver your Self upon this Article, either you have not proved the Dr. to be a Liar, or you have proved him to be an Ideot.

Another of Mr. Bennet's Evidences.

Being order'd, and appointed by the Masters and Wardens of the Company of Stationers to Collect from the Booksellers three Books of each sort Printed, which were due to the two Universities, and the King's Library: I received of Mr. Tho. Bennet a great many Books upon that Account, without any Dispute whatsoever. I find likewise by my Accounts, that his Books, and those from most of the other Booksellers were delivered in before the 13th. Day of July, 1693. And on that Day part of them were sent to the Universities.

Nich. Hooper. Beadle.

The Dr. in his Preface, upon a certain occasion not worth the repeating, had said, That after he was nominated to the Library-Keepers Office (before his Patent was finished) he was informed,

that one Copy of every Book Printed in England, which were due to the Royal Library by Act of Parliament, had not of late been brought into the Library according to the said Act — upon which (passing by for Expedition sake the rest of the Story) he called upon Mr. Bennet, and demanded his share towards it, which was then but very small. But Mr. Bennet, instead of complying with the Demand, answered very pertly, That he knew not what Right the Parliament had to give away any Mans Property. The Company of Stationers were a Body, had a common Purse, and he hop'd they would stand it out at Law, &c.

'Tis for the Disproof of this Story, that Mr. Bennet got this Certificate of the Beadle. Upon which let me only desire the Reader to take particular Notice of, First, this Expression of it, *Delivered in*; and Secondly, the Date of the Year, when the Books were so *Delivered in*. In both which Particulars we shall find Mr. Bennet guilty of a little slight of hand. The Books were *Delivered in*; but who is Mr. Bennet's Deponent here speaking of? of the King's Library-Keeper, I think. And what is he speaking of? Of the King's Library. And where are we to understand these Books to have been *Delivered in*? Into the Royal Library! And when were they so *Delivered in*? before the 13th. Day of July, 1693. Very few Readers would understand this Certificate of the Beadle, in the Connexion it bears, and according to the occasion for which it was produced, in any other meaning. But to our Surprize we find that none of these things were intended by Mr. Bennet.

This Appendix of Mr. Bennet's had not been long out e're he gets some inkling, that all the Abuses

Abuses offered to the Dr. by that Sawcy Book-seller would scarce be put up so tamely as he expected, and fearing thereupon, that *some Body* might re-examine their Beadle upon this lame Account of his; Mr. Bennet presently takes care to be before-hand with them, and with all speed posts out a *Second Edition* of his Appendix; and there, just after this Certificate of his Beadle, he slides in, by way of farther Explication of himself, a little Paragraph wherein the whole Story is *new made*.

*Since the First Edition of this Book *, &c. * P. 116*
 Let the Reader, that thinks it worth his while, see the passage at large; and there he'll find, That neither is the *Library-Keeper* at *S. James's* at all concerned in this Certificate of the Beadle, but the *Treasurer of the Stationers Company*; neither was it the King's Library, the Books were *Delivered into*, but the *Company's Ware-house*; neither had the Dr. any Account of what Books were *Delivered in*, or from what hands they came, but the fore said *Treasurer*: All this appears from Mr. Bennet's own *Second Edition*: The puzzling Account Mr. Bennet had given of this Affair, and the Knowledge I had of his methods, put me indeed upon making some Enquiry into this Story about the Beadle. For seeing such very unfair Dealings from the *Half-Moon* in all the rest of this Controversie; I made no doubt, but here was as much trick and false Colour in this too, if I could but come at the Truth: And so indeed it prov'd; for a Friend of mine, of Mr. Bennet's Trade, got me this following Certificate from the same Beadle, which I have now by me Sign'd by himself. Its consistent indeed with what he deposed before, but it will fully refute the

the false Inferences that Mr. Bennet drew from it.

September 12th. I Deliver'd to the Reverend Dr. Bentley, then Library-Keeper at St. James's, a parcel of Books gather'd for the King's Library, and I never deliver'd any before, either to Him, or to any of his Predecessors; having been Beadle to the Company of Stationers ever since the 26th. of March. 1692.

Nich. Hooper. Beadle.

The Reader may take notice, That the Beadle is positive as to the day of the Month, *September 12th.* when he deliver'd the Books at St. James's: But he does not tell the Year. The Reason was, That he had entred the day of the Month in his Book of Accounts, but he had omitted the Year; and though he believes it was 1694, yet in his *Affidavit* he would affirm no farther, than he could be absolutely sure of. In which he acted like a Man of Conscience; and if Mr. Bennet had been as scrupulous in his own Testimonies, I dare say, this *Phalaridan* Controversie had never been started. But however, as to the Year, when the Books were Deliver'd, we need no Testimony of the Beadle: for it could not possibly be before 1694. because *September 12th.* 1693. Mr. *Jussel* the Dr's Predecessor was still alive, and no Successor then named to him; and its certain from the Date of the Dr's Patent, and from several other authentick Testimonies, that he had no Power, nor Custody of the Library till above half a year after.

Now to Examine Mr. Bennet's Inferences from his Beadle's Certificate, and to compare them with this other from the same hand.

Dr.

Dr. Bentley had said, *That he was informed, that one Copy of every Book Printed in England, which was due to the Royal Library by Act of Parliament, had not of late been brought into the Library according to the said Act.* Upon this I made Application to the Master of the Stationer's Company, and demanded the Copies. The Effect whereof was, that I procur'd near a 1000 Volumes of one sort or other, which are now lodg'd in the Library. Now the Truth of this is confirm'd by the Beadle himself: For he Deposes, that he had never Deliver'd one Book to the Library till after the Dr's Application.

But then comes Mr. Bennet by Dint of Logic to disprove this Account of the Dr's. The Dr. *, says he, *Would be thought, to have first set* * P. 114: *a-foot this Collection due to the Royal Library;* and again, † *The Dr. says, he set about this Project of getting the Books due to the King's Library, Collected;* for so he would have us understand him. And this he disproves, because there was a Collection made in July before, 1693.

Now this is so exactly like Mr. Boyle's way of refuting the Dr.; that one would be apt to suspect, the same hand was employ'd in drawing up both that *Examination*, and this *Appendix*. The way is to Charge the Dr. with saying, what he never said; and then to be sure they must have a great measure of Dulness, if they cannot confute what they invented on purpose to be confuted.

The Bookseller has the Confidence to tell his Readers, *That the Dr. would be thought to have first set a-foot the Collection.* And yet the Dr. in words as full as can be desir'd, has plainly implied the contrary. For he tells us, *The Books had not of late been*

been brought into the Library ; which is a manifest Proof, that he believed himself, and would have his Reader suppose, that they had ~~formerly~~ been brought in according to the Act. For the Act commenc'd soon after the Restauration of K. Charles II. The Books therefore might have been gather'd for many years ; and yet of late have been neglected.

We have one plain Falshood then in the Book-seller's Representation of this matter ; and we shall presently have another. For he talks of the Dr's setting a-foot the *Collection* ; and his Project of having the Books *Collected* ; for so, says he, *the Dr. would have us understand him*. How the Gentlemen of the *Half-Moon* are used to *understand* the Dr's Writings, the World is now pretty well satisfied : But if I may measure other Readers from my self, I durst be bold to affirm, that not one of them could put that Construction upon the Dr's words, unless he either carelessly read him, or wilfully mis-represented him. For the Dr. whose words I have cited above, has not a Syllable about *Collecting* in all that passage : He only says, *The Books had not been brought into the Library* ; which is true beyond Contradiction. But whether some or all of the Books had been *Collected* from the several Booksellers, and laid up in the Stationers Warehouse ; that was more than he could pretend to know. He found, they were not in the Royal Library ; and like an honest and careful Man, he did the Duty of his place, and took care to see them lodg'd there. And without such a Care they might have lain long enough, before the King's Library had been the richer for them. But besides all this, it will appear presently, that

all the Books which were Printed from *June 93.* to *April 94.* might even be *uncollected*, as well as *not brought in* till the Dr. demanded them.

After two such notorious Stretches that the Book-feller has made here in representing the Dr's words, we may easily guess what will become of the rest of what he has brought on this Head. He attempts to prove, *That no such Discourse (i. e.* when the Dr. says, He asked Mr. Bennet to give his share of Books to the King's Library, and Mr. Bennet refused it) *could happen between the Dr. and him*; because it appears by the Beadle, that Mr. Bennet complied to give his share without any Dispute whatsoever, July 13th. 1693. which was before the Dr. was nominated to his Office. And P. 116. the Act of Printing expiring about April, or May 1693.; after that time no Body could pretend to demand Arrears from particular Booksellers.

I must confess, if I had not been pretty well acquainted with the *Half-Moon Sincerity*, I should have thought this Argument a strong one, and very pinching upon the Dr. But being fully perswaded from the rest of their management, that this too was all of a piece; I began to cast about, if I could find any flaw in the Proof; and seeing the main of it depended upon the Act of Printing's expiring in May 1693; I fancied the Deceit must needs lie in that Particular. I know, my Reader will think now, that this was a very unlikely Guess of mine; for how is it credible, that they would falsifie an Act of Parliament, where any Body that had a mind to Examine the matter, might easily discover the Cheat? This I own, was something choaking: For I argued so to my self at that time; but however, since it came into my way, I was resolved to consult

* *Keeble's
Statutes,
p. 1658.*

sult *Keeble* upon the *Statute for Printing*; and there I found, * that the Act of Printing, when it was last revived, commenced from the 13th. of *February* 1693, and from thence continued to the End of the next Session of Parliament, which was *May* 1694.

† *Mr. Ben.
p. 113.*

Let the Reader now reflect a little upon the Impudence of this Bookseller, and those that assisted him; who, rather than say nothing against *Dr. Bentley*, would tell thus in the Face of the Sun the most palpable Falshood. *The Act of Printing*, says he, *expired in April or May, 1693. Therefore the Dr. could not demand Books of me after that time* (as he says he did) *upon that Act of Printing*. But the contrary of this, Sir, is most evident from the Act it self; for it did not expire till *May* 1694. And the Dr. says, that he demanded the Books of you, *after he was nominated to the Library-Keeper's Office, and before his Patent was finished*, that is, as you your Self calculate it; † *sometime between December 23d. (93) and April 18th. (94)* so that he demanded the Books of you while the Statute was in force: And I make no doubt, but he did really demand them of you, both because it became one in his place to do so, and because he made the same demand upon some other Booksellers at the same time, and because you do not offer to disprove it, without telling such manifest Untruths, as all the World may discover.

But you think it utterly incredible, that you should deny the Books to the King's Library upon *Dr. B's* asking, when you had granted them *without any Dispute* to the Beadle. Why, truly Sir, as you by falsifying an Act of Parliament have stated this matter, there appears some Reason

son on your side. For you make the Dr. and the Beadle demand them at or near the same time. But as Mr. Keeble has assisted us to put the Case truly, there's nothing at all improbable in the Dr's Account of this Story. For you might deliver some Books in June 1693. to the Beadle; and yet your Opinion, or your Humour might be chang'd before April 18th. 1694. You say, *The Discourse that the Dr. puts in your Mouth, is all over so absurd and senseless, that no Body that knows you will think you capable of it.* But for me, that do not know you otherwise, than from your share in this Controversie, you'll excuse me, if I think you capable of it, because I find you actually guilty of worse. And I perswade my self, that every Body else, if he take your Character, as I do, from the Papers that carry your Name, will be of my Opinion. P. 118.

As for that Honourable Gentleman, Sir Edward Sherburn's Letter, which he sent to Mr. Bennet, and ordered to be immediately Communicated to the World; all that I shall presume to say of it is this; that the Reader, who shall give himself the trouble of perusing the Dr's Account of the Matter of Fact, to which that Letter refers, will find it so well attested, that he will scarce know how to Charge the Dr. with Falshood, without bringing some other very great Names under the same Suspicion. P. 134. Pref. P. 46, &c.

And as for the Letter of the aforesaid William King. J. C. D. of the Commons, a part of it transcribed, may serve you for Answer to the whole. 'Tis reputable both to Men and Books to be ill spoken of by him, and a favourable Presumption on their side, that there is something in Both which may chance to recommend them to the rest

rest of the World, Witness, The Journey to London, The Dialogues of the Dead, and this Letter, all supposed to come from the same hand.

The last of Mr. Bennet's Testimonies the Reverence due to the Memory of the Dead, obliges me to forbear meddling with.

At the Entrance of my Examination of Mr. Bennet, I was observing, that he could not
 Supp. p. 143. have done the Dr. a greater piece of Service than he hath, by writing this *Appendix*,
 "Wherein he hath so fairly driven the Matter to an Head, and let such light into the Cause, that it can be no longer a Dispute; where the Quarrel began, and what was that unsufferable Affront, which rendred the Dr. an Enemy unfit to receive Quarter. For if Mr. Boyle was not affronted by the Dr. or at least, not to that high Degree he pretends, as I hope, by this time sufficiently appears; there must have been some other Cause of this Disturbance; which what it should have been Mr. Bennet, hath been pleased at
 P. 131. * parting, to give us an enlightning Instance. The Dr. had, it seems, Let slip some untoward Reflections upon a certain, very eminent Person, for setting People at work upon, &c. Nay, and that, if we may believe Mr. Bennet, in very homely Language too. Upon which occasion he tells us, what he once heard a very great Man say of the Dr. &c. And were I for telling Tales out of School, as Mr. Bennet is, I also could tell, what I have heard some not very little Men say upon a certain occasion, not hard to be guess'd at, concerning a certain very great Man. 'Tis a Strange thing that the ... of ... should

should so encourage his young Men in their, &c.
 But great Men may make as free with one P. 132.
 another as they please: It becomes me to con-
 sider my Distance; and so I will; for I shall make
 no Reflections my Self. But if the Gentlemen
 of the Half-Moon are resolv'd to go on in
 their Insults upon the Dr. at the rate they
 have hitherto done, representing one of the
 greatest Scholars in the Land for a Duncce,
 † a Man that neither understands Books him-
 self, nor knows how to be Civil to them that
 do; they may perhaps in time, (as I fancy they
 begin to do already) hear what many very great
 Men say of Them.

† *Fabular.*
Aspic.
Delict.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

Page 47. l. 17. r. writing against Dr. B. l. 21. r. to a B. p. 48. l. 19.
 r. Copy. p. 50. l. 10. after number, add, out of Suidas. p. 54. l. 32.
 after 210. add, as they are in Mr. St. are also marked out in the INDEX
 to Stephanus, &c. p. 56. l. 31. r. Fulgentius Planciades. p. 57. l. 13.
 r. MS. p. 93. l. 12. for u r. v. p. 99. l. 16. r. Eragment. p. 100. l. 12.
 r. dñs. p. 111. l. 20. r. Aconcius. p. 129. l. 6. for Marriage r. Wed-
 ding. p. 130. l. 19. r. that, cf. p. 131. l. 26. r. -ΩΝΩΗ- p. 138. l. 14.
 r. Inventionē. Hujus.